



Ex Bibliotheca
majori Coll. Rom.
Societ. Jesu

II . 3 . f

PROTESTANCY

WITHOUT

PRINCIPLES.

OR,

SECTARIES VNHAPPY FALL

FROM

INFALLIBILITY TO FANCY.

Laid forth in four Discourses by ^{Edward} E. Worsely. S. J.

*Si etiam opertum est Euangelium nostrum: in iis qui percunt
est opertum. 2. Cor. 4. 3.*

*Biblioth. Sciv.
Soc.*



*Coll. Rom.
S. J.*



PRINTED AT ANTWERP,
By MICHAEL CNOODART, in the Year 1668.

Permissu Superiorum.

8. 4. B. 44



PRINTED AT ANTHELM
BY MICHAEL SCHNEIDER, in the year 1866.
PUBLISHED BY

B

THE
P R E F A C E
TO THE
R E A D E R.



*He Books are almost innumera-
ble occasion'd by an unhappy He-
resy , that in the last age infe-
sted Germany , and after like a
Leprosy, Overspread the greatest
part of our Northern Countries.
Too many are writ by Those, who
stile themselves Protestants , or of the Reformed Reli-
gion, not to speak of the Subdivissions as Arminians,
Brownists, Anabaptists, or of their Followers, which crum-
ble into as many Sects as men. Of These we have VVri-
ters, who with no little Animosity in veigh bitterly one
against an other . Yet (because Self-interest will have
it so) All of them closely joyn in a Foul dishonorable Lea-
gue against an Ancient Mother Church That made them
and their Progenitors Christians.*

THE PREFACE

This hath stirr'd up the pen of many a learned man; not so much to confute their weak Discourses, as positively to Assert Truth which cannot be shaken, and to Vndeceive a poor sort of seduced People, who easily gain'd by sleek VVords and the Specious Pretenses of some (who have told untruth so long, that at last they almost Believe it Themselves) insensibly fall into error. To Vnbeguile these deluded Souls more, I have here cast my Mite also into the Treasury of these learned labours, and writ this Treatise. VVherin I both lay forth the Evidence of our Roman Catholick Religion upon undoubted Grounds, and make it likewise manifest That Protestancy, as Reformed, which is only a fallible taught Doctrin, cannot be Resolved into Gods Infallible Revelation, and therefore is no part of Christian Religion, But a meer Opinion only Vpheld by Fancy.

I undertook the small work you here se upon this occasion. About a year since, (so much it was when I writ this Preface) A friend sent me a Book with a surly imperious Title. The Nullity of the Romish Faith; or a blow at the root of the Romish Church. By Mr. Matthew Poole printed anno 1666. and only desired me to make a few Observations upon an Appendix by the same Author against a Converted Gentleman. Curiosity ledd me on to read the whole book,

TO THE READER.

book, where finding little worth the Answering, I laid it aside for two or three months, till I was urged again to return some short Answer to the Appendix. But while this business gave me a little entertainment, We here (though at distance) Heard a noise of a Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion &c. by Mr. Edward Stillingfleet. The book I saw but lately, yet some Parcels of his Doctrin found the way to me by several Reports, and Letters also. Whereupon, I laid Mr. Pooles Appendix aside, And was longer in this Treatise then I intended, or was indeed necessary to Answer the Appendix, which yet may have an Answer timely enough.

By the way, as far as sure Principles can Guide one, and a few Glances at Mr. Pooles Doctrin will reach to, I refuse some weak ground's of His Nullity, which is as much as it deserves. That of Mr. Stillingfleet Merit's more, I mean a larger Refutation. Though to speak Truth, it is too tediously long and both says very much, and very little: Much in Generalities and cavilling at our Catholick Faith, But little in giving any Account of Protestant Religion as 'tis now reformed, which yet was the only Thing I sought for, but found not in his writings, as I have often noted in this Treatise. Had I had his book sooner, or more time, I would have refused some more chief points in it, but I hope I have

THE PREFACE

have it in hand, that will bring the Author to a better account; for he who first Tell's amiss must count twice, before He make a Right reckoning,

I wave all along, as much as may be, an unnecessary Repetition of known Authorities drawn from Scripture, and Fathers (for that were *Aſum agere*) and endeavor to ground my Discours upon undoubted Principles. And my chief aim is, as I now insinuated, to make it evident, That Protestancy built upon Fancy, stand's tottering without the Support of any acknowledged Principles, and consequently Fall's of it self. To speak more plainly: When Sectaries go about, either to impugn the Roman Catholick Doctrin, or to establish their Own, They give you nothing that look's like a sure owned Principle, but quite contrary, tire you out with long loos Discourses, which driven on to the very last, at most come to no more but to Guesſes only, weak Conjectures, and the unproved Thoughts of those who make them. In a word, They never fall on Principles, nor can make their own Doctrin good upon any better Argument. then by only saying, It is True, or cavilling at ours: As if't were the way for a man to Prove Himself honest, by saying his neighbour is not so; or enough to Establish Their House built upon sand to assert that ours, once certainly settled on a Rock, is not Th' ancient building it was but hath been repayr'd, and otherwise Adorn'd. If all this were true (as it is most fals) what's
their

D

TO THE READER.

their House the better, that's still upon sand? Or, their Religion sounder, that stand's Vnprincipled without Scripture, Church, or Reason? I only say thus much in a Preface, and prove it afterward in the following Discourses, which I was advised to write in Latin, having now more use of That (I may thank my long Absence from England for it) then is allowed me of our Mother Tongue. *But sapientibus & insipientibus debitor sum.* I desire to satisfy all, and owe as much to the Illiterate of my dear Country as to the Learned, and therefore shall Expose this Treatise in plain English (for I can speak no better) and hope upon that Account to find the Readers easier Pardon If I often Speak improperly, or now and then break Priscians head in English.

Sometimes as the matter requires, I am forc'd to make use of words that may seem harsh as Toyes, Fancies, Trifles not worth the Answering &c. But 'tis impossible for me to use other language, if I'll call things by their right names, and give the world to understand what they are, Smoother termes would look like Mockery (whilst Secretaries use harsher) rather then Civility. Believe what you will. I Profess seriously, all I say is without Passion, or Design to reflect Personally upon our Adversaries whom I pitty and pray for, having no intention to reproach them, but to Reprove Heresy, To rail at any, but to convince by Reason.

But


THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

BUT I keep you too long at the Door, open and read without Prejudice, and if you be not satisfied with what I write, of Charity give me timely notice, for my dayes are almost Don. In the other world I can make no Answer but to Almighty God, for the sincerity of my undertaking: wherby if any one soule reap benefit, I have enough; if none do so, my comfort is, that He who knows my good intention will be my ample Recompence, though infinitely above my desert,

Farewel,

A NE

A NECESSARY
ADVERTISEMENT
FOR THE
READER.

1.  Ay it pleas Any one to read this Treatise, And either seek to profit by it, or vouchsafe to return an Answer, He will I hope, after a general thought, cast on what I intend to prove in the ensuing Discourses, take particular Notice also of a few Notes here set down which may perhaps conduce to His better satisfaction.

2. Concerning the first. We need not to say much. My Intent is Chiefly to prove These four Things. 1. That Sectaries are Churchles, because They acknowledge no infallible Church on earth. Yet there are Infallible Teachers (and consequently an infallible Church) as is Demonstrated in the first Discours. 2. That
b They

A NECESSARY

They are as Scriptureles as Churchles, and have not one syllable of Gods Word for Protestancy Therefore we treat in the second Discours of Their mangling and misinterpreting Scripture. 3. That Their Proceeding is most Vnreasonable in some chief controversies handled in the third Discours. 4. We prove in the fourth Discours, the Roman Catholick Church to be the only true *Church of Christ*, And there also lay Forth the improbability of Protestant Religion. All this is Don to make good what the Title briefly expresses. *Viz Protestancy is without Principles of Scripture, Church and Reason.* Now a word of what I would have you to Note.

3. It is truly lamentable, to se how controversies in these our dayes are driven on to nothing but to endles quarrels. There is certainly some cause of so long a work, which might, methinks, be brought to a period with less Adoe. And what is it, think ye? Is it because Christs true Religion cannot be made evidently credible to Reason? No certainly. For, that Religion which hath stood invincible in the heat of so many persecutions, which hath converted whole Kingdoms and Nations, and drawn Millions of souls to it, must necessarily appear most

cvi-

ADVERTISEMENT.

evidently Credible to all rational men. Is it because a fals Religion cannot be Argued of Falshood? No. It is as easy to convince an erroneous Sect of errour, as to prove true Religion to be true. And Hence, I say, it is impossible to conceive any Thing like Religion, that can neither be Proved evidently credible, or manifestly Argued of Falshood. The Reason is, Because the evident Credibility of true Religion (if one only be true in the V World) takes off from the fals Religion all *Prudent credibility*, and leaves it utterly destitute of Motives founding credibility. In a word, The *evident credibility* of Truth makes Falshood highly improbable. V\ hence I infer. If true Religion be made thus manifestly *credible* by Almighty God, Rational Proofs cannot fail to countenance that which He will have *manifestly known*. Contrarywise, such proofs must of necessity be wanting to a fals Religion, which God will have to appear both *evidently Incredible*, and *Improbable* to *prudent Reason*. The Catholick therefore that hold's his Religion at least *evidently Credible* before He believes, and *certainly true* by his Act of Faith, cannot but have Proofs at hand which Do not only clearly evidence the undoubted *Credibility* of it, but also Dash and Discounte-

A NECESSARY

nance what ever can be said in the Defence of a contrary Errour. On the other side, The Sectary must of necessity want such grounded Proofs; And consequently whether he Defend's his own, or impugn's the true Religion, All He saith will end at last in meer Cavils and wordy Fallacies. You have the Reason Hereof more largely laid forth Disc. 1. C. 8. Because God cannot permit in the Presence (as it were) of his true Religion a fals Sect to appear so much as slightly Probable, which ever is and must be inferior to Truth (or rather nothing) in the lustre and evidence of *Credibility*. Which is to say in other Terms: *An Erroneous Sect cannot be made at all Credible to Reason.*

4. What then is the Reason, when the Catholick both supposeth and proves His Religion to be only true and Orthodox, that These strifes go endlessly on between us and a few Protestants? Scarce any Book, though never so solid and learned, is set forth by an English Catholick, but presently a *Thing* called an Answer sallies out against it. Exceptions are made by Sectaries, This, They say, Proves not, That Displeases &c. In a word, if we believe them, All is Answered, when, God knowes, A
pru-

ADVERTISEMENT.

prudent Reader see's the main Difficulties waded, And very often finds the very state of the Question grossly mistaken. I'll say my thought freely, and humbly submit all I say to the prudent Censure of every learned Catholick. As long as Sectaries (without a just and rational Reproof, *it's all we can Do*) are permitted to continue still the strain of writing they constantly follow, which is to entertain the Reader with tedious Discourses in general of Christian Religion, when Protestancy is that which should be Proved, with meer conjectures, bare negative Arguments And unproved Propositions, with their own forced and violent interpretations when an Authority urgeth, In a word, with their Gues-ses and unworthy Cavils seasoned with jeers when nothing els will Doe &c. whilst this is Don, The close way of Arguing is laid aside, They may talk on to the worlds end, without fruit to Any but to the Printer only, that gains money by their Books. You will ask wat Remedy Against this proceeding? An old Answer sayes much: It is : When they go about, either to prove their own Novelties, or to impugn our Catholick Doctrin, That we keep them from wandering to far from home, and Hold them close

A NECESSARY

to *Proofs and Principles* (these are the Shollers lawes, our Rules and Canons) Do this, and you'll soon se their long Discourses Shrunk up to little, Their large volumes brought to a few sheets of paper. Now if they refuse to stand to Principles, we must leave them to Fancy, And show how they both Disgrace their cause, and themselves also.

5. By this word *Principle*, or *Principles*, I understand in our present matter a strong rational, satisfactory, *Intellectual light*, that prudently forceth Reason to acquiesce in a *Verity proposed*: whether it arise from solid grounds of Reason, or from great Authority, matters little, so it be prudently *Persuasive* and forceably work on a well disposed understanding. Judges Decide by some measure of it in their equitable Sentences, And Schoolmen should not want it in their Opinions. But, much more is requisite when we speak of Religion wheron salvation Depends; For here a far greater light a better Assurance (Surmounting meer Probability) is necessary, which cannot be darkned by Fallacies, or weakned by *Trivial Fetches*. You have the ground hereof Declared Disc. 1. C. 8. Because God, that lead's us in this present state to the knowledge of His Revealed Truths, not by Enthusiasms

ADVERTISEMENT.

thusiasms or private Illustrations , but by prudent Inducements suitable to Reason, always makes his true Religion so manifest by undubitable Signs, Marks, and Characters, that not only the learned , but the more ignorant may come (if prudence Guide him) to a clear Sight of it by certain Principles. We may, I think, proceed as securely by light enough laid out to Reason in this weighty matter, as we do in other great Verities. For example : All acknowledge Gods Divine Providence over the world, and Therefore have strong Principles to prove the Truth. We Christians say , That *Christ* our Lord And His Apostles taught most certain Heavenly Doctrin. Principles cannot be wanting to prove this our Christian Verity. VVe say , *Judaism* and *Mahometism* are Fals Sects: The Assertion can be made Good by sure and undoubted Proofs. The only Question now under Dispute is, whether we Catholicks or Sectaries profess and Teach the Ancient Orthodox Doctrin established by *Christ* and his Apostles, And without all Controversy certain Principles cannot fail in this particular , wherby the difference between us may be decided : Or if they Do fail, (which is not possible) every one may not only adhere

A NECESSARY

adhere without reproof to any Religion or none, as Fancy pleaseth; But, moreover may most justly blame Almighty God (And this is hideously impious) who commands us on the one side to embrace true Religion, yet on the Other, Leaves us in such Fearful darknes, That none after a diligent search can find out by sure Principles, *What* or *Where* that Religion is which He will have us to believe, to make profession of, to live and dye in. And this would be highly contrary to his infinit Goodnes. Thus much premised.

6. I say first. The Sectary, whether He takes in hand to establish his own Opinions, or to impugn any Doctrine of our Catholick Faith, shall never come to an Intellectual light that hath a likelihood of a sure Principle. The Reason is most evident in Catholick grounds (I say no more yet) *Because Truth cannot be contrary to Truth*: If therefore Catholick Religion be true, whatever the Sectary sayes against it, when he either Plead's for his own, or oppugn's our Doctrine, must of necessity be so remote from sure Principles, That his whole Talk, *ultimately Resolved*, will appear in its own likenes a meer cheat, and end in nothing but a fallacy; For it is not *Possible* to
force

ADVERTISEMENT.

force Truth out of *Falshood*, or to make that Probable which is *Essentially improbable*.

7. I say 2. It cannot but be most manifest to every prudent disinterested Judgement, That Sectaries have nothing like sound received Principles to rely on, whether They oppugn our Catholick Doctrin, or Defend their own Opinions. To clear this Assertion from Cavils, you shall see what we propose. Be pleased only to take two or three sheets of paper (much more is not needful) And permit a learned Catholick *briefly* to set down in the first Pages of them, the Proofs he hath for his Catholick Doctrin in one particular Controversy now agitated (this short way of Arguing will do the deed) Then let the Protestant write all he can say for his contrary *Proposition* in the other Pages, And if you do not see a strange *unequal Parallel* of Proofs, And no Proofs laid together, call me what you will, I'll bear a just rebuke, yet fear not any. I say, pitch upon *One Controversy* now in Dispute. For Example that one long debated (we cannot now insist upon all) may be thought of. *Viz. Whether Recours had to the Saints in Heaven by the Prayers of the living, be erroneous or true Doctrin?*

A NECESSARY

Next permit the Question to be truly stated, and then Hear what the Catholick sayes for Himself. He tell's you first the Roman Catholick Church and the Greek Church also, whether Orthodox or Schismatical teach, as He believes. 2. He produceth Scriptures to prove his Doctrin. 3. He alleges Fathers both Greek and Latin quoted by every Polemical writer on this subject. *Bellarmin* furnissheth you most plentifully *lib. 1. de Sanct. Beati cap. 19.* The wit of man cannot wrest them to a sense contrary to our Catholick Position. 4. You will have His Reasons, and that one most concluding: Good men laudably pray for us here on earth: *Ergo*, much more the Saints in Heaven (because in a better state) can do that Charity. When the Catholick hath ended his Proofs grounded on these and the like undeniable Principles. Cast your thoughts a little on the Sectaries Contrary proofs, And mark well his Principles. Hath He any Church reputed Orthodox either now, or six hundred years ago, That expressly and positively defended his Opinion, and condemned our Doctrin? No, most evidently not any. Hath he so much as one syllable of Scripture, that plainly and positively

ADVERTISEMENT.

tively Denyes our Catholick position, and speak's for his? Not a word is found in the whole Bible to that purpose, much against it. Hath he Fathers so numerous and clear for his Novelty, as we produce for this one Truth, *Saints can both bear and help us*? Not one Father is express against us, or plain for his contrary Opinion. Parallel therefore a Church and no Church, Scripture and no Scripture, Fathers express for us, and not one against us: And judge you whether it be not evident to every disinterested judgement, that Protestants want sound Principles to rely on in this Controversy. And as you see a Defect of Principles here, so you will find it in all other Disputes between us. Now if they say, They value not much of our *Church Authority*. I answer, They speak without Principles, For the sole judgement of our Church (had we no more) will be thought in any just Tribunal a stronger proof for our Doctrine, then their meer slighting of it can be *without* a likelihood of proof. If They say again, They can either Deny or explicate the Fathers we produce; I Answer, They are still out of Principles: *For their Denial is weightles, unless They ground it upon a surer Principle, then that Authority is, which they*

A NECESSARY

Deny. Observe well. We have innumerable Fathers Greek and Latin express for the Invocation of Saints. Say therefore, What will it Avail the Sectary barely to reject these Authorities (because they are the words of men and not of God) Unless He Give you the plain word of God, or the Authority of an Orthodox Church (in place of them) *whereon his Denial hath sure footing?* If this be not don, He comes to nothing like a Principle, consequently the Fathers Authority (most agreeable to the Churches Doctrin) is a clear Demonstration against him. If He Pretend to allege Fathers contrary to ours: I Answer, He hath not one *express or plainly contrary*. However, falsely suppose, He had one or two, The contest would then be, whether one that stands, as it were, alone opposit to the Churches Doctrin, or many Fathers that side with the Church deserve more credit? Here I am sure He will stand without footing on any certain Principle. If He tell you Thirdly, The Primitive Church prayed not to Saints: They are his own empty words: We prove the contrary, by the express Testimonies of most ancient Fathers, and the Tradition of our Church, whilst He remains speechless and without a Principle

ADVERTISEMENT.

ciple to ground his Assertion on. If He Ob-
ject fourthly. His Reasons, chiefly two viz.
Prayers to Saints lessens our Honor to Christ. And,
we cannot say how our prayers come to the Saints Hear-
ing &c. I Answer. Here is nothing pro-
bable, for an Objection (as soon solved as seen)
is far off from the nature of a sound Principle. We
say therefore, if to pray for one an other Here
on Earth lessens not *Christs* Honor, there is no
danger of lessening it by our recours had to the
Saints in Heaven, now in a most Glorious and
happy Condition. And thus, no less a Doctor
then *S. Hierom, Adversus vigilantium*, Paris print 1609.
pag. 590. Solves the Difficulty at those words.
Dicis in libello tuo &c. Thou, *Vigilantius*, saith in
thy Book, that whilst we live we may pray for one
another, but after Death no Prayer is heard for
Any. Here is the Objection. Mark *S. Hie-*
roms Answer: *Si Apostoli & Martyres adhuc in corpore*
constituti, possunt orare pro ceteris; quando pro se debent esse
soliciti: quanto magis post coronas, victorias & trium-
phos. If the Apostles and Martyrs yet living in
a mortal body, can pray for others, when they
are solicitous for themselves: much more, can
they do that Charity after their Crowns, Victo-
ries, and Triumphs. He goes on. *Vnus ho-*

A NECESSARY

mo *Moyſes* &c. That one *Moyſes* obtained pardon for thousands *Exod.* 32. And the first Martyr *S. Stephen* living, prayed for his Persecutors *Act.* 7. *Et postquam cum Christo esse ceperint minus valēbunt?* And what, shall they be able to do less now, when they are glorious with *Christ* in Heaven? *Melior ē erit vigilantius catus vivens, quam ille leo mortuus.* And can thou, *Vigilantius*, a living Dog, be better then that dead Lyon, (He alludes to *S. Paul* that prayed for others whilst he lived?) *Tu vigilans dormis, & dormiens scribis.* I tell thee, *Vigilantius*, waking thou sleep's, and sleeping writ's these things against prayer to Saints. Thus *S. Hierom.* And not only *S. Austin lib.* 22. *de Civit.* c. 8. (to omit innumerable others) Approves the Doctrine, but that worthy Bishop also, *S. Greg Nyssen* in his Oration of *S. Theodore Martyr*, Paris print 1615. page 1011. and 1017. confirms the Practice of it. Pray for us, saith *S. Gregory* (addressing himself by an earnest Petition to *S. Theodore* when the *Seythians* threatned a war to the Country) make intercession to him who is our common King and Lord. As you are a souldier fight for us and defend us, And as a Martyr speak freely for your fellows servants here. A few lines after. And if more Prayer be needful, assemble together the whole Quire of

ADVERTISEMENT.

of your Brethren Martyrs, and joyntly intercede for us. Put S. Peter in mind, move S. Paul, and the beloved Disciple of our Lord S. Iohn, that they be solicitous for the Churches, where once they wore Chains, passed dangers, and finally Dyed. Say now, what lessening is here of Christs Honor by the prayer of this Ancient Saint and most learned Prelate? Or what answer can be returned to these three Authorities? The other Difficulty is as forceles: For if Sectaries can explicate how the blessed Soul of our Saviour in Heaven hear's our Prayers, which I hope they will not Deny (I speak of his Sanctified created Soul) all Difficulty ceaseth in the present Controversy: *How They hear* is opinion (se Bell. cap. 20. n. *Argumentum tertium*) But *That they Hear*, is certain Doctrin.

7. Now if Sectaries tell us They can so explicate These Fathers as to make their words insignificant to our Purpose: I would first learn, what can be said to S. Hierom, S. Austin, and S. Gregory now cited; But this is not all, for I am to assure them further, That their explications, when contrary to the Doctrin of a whole Church, as also to the obvious sense of either Scripture or Fathers quoted by us, are so far off from being Principles, that they merit not the name of mean probabilities; which Truth

is

A NECESSARY

is more amply Declared *Discours 4. c. 4. n. 8. 9.* Where I prove that no Interpretation of Sectaries can be Allowed of, unles it rely on an extrinsick Ground much surer then His Gloss is that interpret's, which therefore must be plain Scripture, The undoubted consent of Fathers, Vniversal Tradition, or such like convincing Principles. Herce I said, when the Catholick Interprets a dubious or Difficil Passage, He never makes his *Gloss to be the ultimate Proof of his Doctrin*, But supposeth that proved by stronger Principles *distinct from His Interpretation.* All is contrary with the Sectary, *who makes His Gloss to do all, to be the last and surest ground of his Opinion, without the Support of any better Proof then his own word is.* And thus much is evident in other Controversies now Debated between us, as you will see Hereafter.

8. From this want of clear Principles, all the too manifest and most Discernable Faint proceeding of our Adversaries in matters now controverted, shewes it self so openly, that one with half an Eye may Discover it. It is From want of Principles, That they now begin to be weary of Protestancy, and hold that a Faith Common to all Sectaries is sufficient to Saluation: if this
may

ADVERTISEMENT.

may Pass, They need not herafter to stand more for Protestancy then Arianism, or for any other condemned Heresy. For the same Principles (were there Any) would make both *Setts equally Credible*. Hence it also is, That you have them ever Cavilling at our Religion (and 'Tis the easiest thing in the world to Find fault; Yea, and to cavil at the verities of Holy Scripture it self, you se Arians do so) but still you find them wanting in that which concern's them most; which is to bring their *Novelties* to the grounds of either *Scripture*, or any Ancient *Church Doctrin*: Herin they are as mute, as Fishes, and say not a word. It is from want of Principles, That, when they explicate a Council or Father alleged against them, They are tediously long about little, that is in relating the circumstances to be as They would have Them, but whether they hit right is ever a matter of Dispute, and nothing like a received Principle. From hence it also is, That when They make such and such Doctrins to be Innovations (Praying to Saints Purgatory, or what els you will) The very last ground They standon, comes to nothing but *Negative Arguments*,

A NECESSARY

ments, weak Conjectures, blind Guesses, Fancy, and meer Uncertainties. It is From the want of Principles, That when we produce undeniable History for innumerable Miracles wrought in our Church, An odd Answer is at hand: *They cannot believe them*, as if, forsooth, Their Parole or meer Unbelief, had force enough to make null all that is writ of this subject by most approved Authors. From want of Principles it is, That they ever place against our clear Authorities no more but meer uncertain Testimonies, And pick out of our Writers all they can pilfer for Their Advantage, whereas, if they had a good cause in hand and sound Principles to rely on, They should beat down the Doctrine of our long standing Church, by undeniable Proofs, taken from Scripture, Councils, and Consent of Fathers, wherof more presently. From hence it also is, That when a Doctrine pleaseth them, Tradition is approved of; But if it be contrary to their Fancy, then Tradition is of no account or value. For example. Prayer for the Dead is as well a universal Tradition of both the Greek, and Latin Church, as to hold that Canon of the

Secta-

ADVERTISEMENT.

Sectaries Bible to be the Word of God, yet the one is admitted of, And the other set light by, And upon what Principle (Distinct from unproved Conjectures) Do They take and leave as they list? Finally, it is for want of Principles, That in *lieu* of solid Arguments in every Controversy now handled you have words in stead of *Substance*, margents painted with *Greek and Latin*, now a story told of a Pope or Prelate, now a jeer, now a jest in handsom language &c. And thus they hold on in their Merriments, Thoughtles, as it seems, of an accounting Day to come before a sever ludge, and a long Eternity that fallows. And to what purpose are these light Skirmishes and petty Doings in a serious matter wheron salvation depend's, whilst God is dishonored, souls are beguiled, Christs sacred Truths also infinitely suffer, by them who will yet be named Christians.

9. I call them here *petty Doings*. For when on the one side I set before my Eyes our Roman Catholick Church (once founded by *Christ*) and therefore must hold it most Ancient and confessedly true. When again I find it of a vast
d 2 extent

A NECESSARY

extent diffused the whole world over, And as much renowned as largely Extended. When I see it glorious Evidenced by Miracles, powerful in the Conversions of Infidels, eminent in Sanctity, And most profound learning. When I consider How it hath stood invincible in the heat of all persecutions, and call to mind the Heresies vainquished by it Age after Age, To say no more now of other signal Marks wherwith it is made illustrious and visible to all. VVhen (I say) I consider these Truths. Methinks evident Reason Tells me, that a few slight Cavils cannot much annoy or hurt it. No. Either clear Demonstrations, or (were it possible) more then Demonstrations ought to enter here, and shake this our strong Fortrefs, Or, if they do not, Common Prudence obliges me to own this for *Christs* true Spouse, or to Grant, (which is hideously Against the Grounds of Christianity) that there is no such Thing as an Orthodox Church in the world.

10. Now on the other side, when I cast my Thoughts on a Few late risen Company of Divided Sectaries, utterly Destitute of all
pru-

prudent Motives, without Antiquity, Miracles, Conversions, or other Evidences of Credibility; when again I seriously ponder how slightly they goe to work against us, How weakly They attempt with meer Trifles (remote from Proofs and Principles) to Vnroot (as it were) this strong Building of our Catholick Society, I stand astonish'd, and must needs say, They seem to be men not too thoughtful of Eternity, And never can wonder enough at Their boldnes, whilst They dare, as they do, to take pen in hand, and presume to write against an Ancient Church, that made the world and their own Progenitors Christians. But what is Hitherto briefly hinted at, will be more largely laid forth in the ensuing Discourses.

II. Now it is high time to end an Advertisement, and to tell our Adversaries my absolute Resolution. It is thus. Let who will pretend to Answer this Treatise either in part or whole, Nothing shall draw me to Reply, unless He that Answers come more closely to Principles, then I ever yet saw in Protestant Writer. It is a sin to trifle our precious time

A NECESSARY ADVERTISEMENT.

away in Cavils. I'll hartily thank any that may
pleas to Answer upon Grounded Principles:
but if He fail Herin , His labour will be lost
and mine hereafter spared, All I shall Do (if
I do so much) will be to tell him were He
missoth in the Main point which is to come
closely to Principles.



ER.

ERRATA *CORRIGENDA.

Page 4. line 5. oft Read of page 6. last line retour R. return.
p.11. l.4. put R. but p.17. l.24. teach R. reaches p.19. l.10. as it
R. as it is p.22. l.13. feaching R. teaching p.22. l.23. true R. true
p.24 l.8. Infalibility R. Infallibility p.22. Title Teachere R. Tea-
cher p.25. l.1. trough R. through p.26. l.1. foor R. for p.27. l.2.
afterward R. afterward p.30. Tit. futher R. further p.39. l.24. te
R. the p.40. Tit. Relyes R. Replies p.41. l.16. in R. it p.43. l.11.
affurance R. assurance p.46. Title Relyes R. Replies p.47. l.27.
fundemeetals R. fundamentals p.53. l.14. dot R. doth p.58. l.2.
verities R. verities p.69. l.4. it if followes *dele* if p.69. l.9. praging
R. praying p.69. l.23. Realon R. Reason p.71. l.17. which R. which
p.74. l.1. fo rit R. for it p.77. l.17. Father R. Fathers p.77. l.30.
standingh R. standing p.81. Title *dele* certainty p.90. l.7. owing
R. owning p.93. Marg. lost R. lost p.94. l.12. is R. it p.94. l.13.
Prophet R. Prophets p.103. Marg. few R. few p.113. Tit. Prave
R. Prove p.141. Marg. propose R. proposed p.143. l.6. pretend
R. pretend's p.144. l. totterin R. tottering p.149. l.20. other
R. others p.158. Marg. te R. to p.159. l.2. Christ R. Christs p.159.
Marg. no Read not p.175. l. 6. opposit, opposite Read oppo-
site p.178. l.5. stead R. instead p.182. l.21. were sent R. they were
sent p.182. l.27. casting of R. casting out p.184. Marg. uncom-
possible R. impossible p.186. l.5. both R. but p.189. l.17. see
R. seem p.195. Marg. an R. on p.209. l.28. interpred R. interpreted
p.212. Marg. Society R. Society p.215. l.4. Propecyng R. Prophecyng
p.217. l.24. if self R. it self p.218. l.5 yo R. you p.222. l.29. Objec-
tiou R. Objection p.228. l.9. of R. or p.256. Marg. canstits R. con-
sists p.256. l.12. nos R. not p.260. l.7. ptofed R. proposed p.261.
Marg. datiful R. dutiful p.262. Marg. doclare R. declare p.269.
Lio' castlely R. caustlely p.275. l.29. both we *dele* both p.278. l.13.
reclaim R. convert p.295. l.15. Chutch R. Church p.302. Marg.
uncluding R. uncluding p.311. Marg. carefer R. care for p.313.
Marg. in in *dele* in p.314. l.16. sh R. she p.318. l.32. dirt R. dirt
p.329. l.26. unevidenced R. unevidenced p.330. l.29. An R. and
p.342. l.30. party R. parity p.344. l.5. An R. and p.346. l.10. thele
R. those p.350. l.10. Cutch R. Church p.351. l.13. for long a time
R. for

THE INTRODVCTION.



Efore we enter upon the following discourses, I must need's have a word with *Mr. Poole*, whose *Nullity*, and *Appendix* (but chiefly the request of a friend) induced me to write this Treatise. It is very true, after one serious perusal of this *Nullity*, I had enough of it, and therefore judged it unnecessary, and indeed not worth the pains to answer *Karà mēdas*, or to follow the Author through his Mazes, and long wandring parergons. I returne him undoubted grounds of true Religion (they are undeniable) which at least destroy his best Principles; and if I mistake not, this is fully as much as a *Nullity* deserves. However, if he desire more, he may probably have it in another Treatise. Now, if you ask, why I took this way of answering, if yet you'll call it an Answer, I'll tell you. My ayme is not so much to meddle with this *Nullity*, as to speak for the Catholik cause, and prove something, which shall not be answered. Again:

A

Is

It is more then tedious, ever to be encountering a few old worn-out Arguments (set forth in new dresses) which have been confuted a hundred times over. Thirdly : No small part of this Nullity seem's to be too trivial, while later Catholick writers are introduced speaking, as *Mr. Poole* thinks, disadvantageously, and against our Faith. Now *Sixtus Senensis* sayes *this*, now *Bellarmin* *that*, now *Stapleton* a third thing, &c. And are these, think ye, doughty Doings for such an Antagonist, that offers to strike at the *very root* of the Roman Church? Alas, what he cites thus, were all he cites true, is a Nullity indeed, and a meernothing; for *Church Doctrin* depends on no mans private opinion: But, when we make an inspection into these Authors (as I have done on several occasions, and find them quored by halves, weighed out of their circumstances, mangled, and traduced to a sinister sense) we must speak truth, That cheats will go on their way, and rather play at small game, then sit out, or seem to do nothing.

Had Protestants any thing like a good cause in hand, or Truth on their side, they would certainly plead more manfully for it, and never like poor people in harvest, go thus a gleaning up and down our Authors (known for professed Catholicks)

liks) who little, God knows, intended to favour Sectaries by such segments, as they are pleased to pick up, much less to furnish Protestants with armour against Catholik Doctrin. But what will ye? Sectaries can do no better, Yet I must tell you what they ought to do, whilst they embrace a Novelty, and cast of the old Religion. They should make the ancient Canons to roar against our Doctrin, they should confound and overwhelm us with undeniable proofs, drawn from plain Scripture, ancient Councils, universal Tradition, and the unanimous consent of Fathers: Of these we hear no great noise. Next (and this most concerns them) They should also *positively* prove, and establish every Article of Protestant Religion, as *Protestancy*, by such plain, open, and illustrious Authorities, then a *Bellarmin*, a *Stapleton*, a *Maldonate* and others might well follow the rear: But to vapour with a few broken fragments, I'll espyed in these Modern Authors (and worse applied) without attending to their whole drift, *antecedent* and *consequent*; and think to defeat an Ancient Church with such trivial Doings, is so slight a way of skirmishing, that it deserves no counterblow, but pity and compassion. That incomparable Author of the *Protestants Apology*, learn's them ano-

4 THE INTRODUCTION.

ther way of arguing, whilst he doth not only shew the endles clashing of Sectaries amongst themselves, but moreover solidly proves our Catholik Doctrin *positively*, and this by the most satisfactory and undeniable Principles, that a lover of Truth can wish for.

Thus these new men should defend their cause, and it is no fault of ours that they trifle it out, and do no better. We charge enough upon them, and could they well acquit themselves, they would certainly go more closely to work, and answer directly. We say, and will prove it, That, that Doctrin which they believe as *Protestants*, contrary to the Roman-Catholik Faith, is evidently no part of any Christian belief, but a meer Opinion grounded on fancy only. We say, and will prove it, that this new Religion of Protestancy hath all the marks and characters of heresy following it, which can be thought on: not one is wanting; for, if *Arius* of old, who quited the ancient Roman Church, and banded against it, was, upon that account, both *schismatick* and *heretick*, our Sectaries are *in eadem nave*, and have done so, their cause and case, in other matters, is the very same. 2. As *Arius* stood all alone at his first rise, opposite to the rest of Christians, and was opposed by all, so
were

THE INTRODUCTION. 5

were they also both opposite, and opposed by all. 3. As he began without commission to broach his Novelties against the ancient Faith, so are they as wholly uncommissioned to preach Theirs: And here we give them matter enough to work on, and conjure them to produce their commission. 4. As *Arius*, supported by secular power, vented what ever he pleased without curb, or any superiour law to check him, and therefore fell into desperate Extravagancies; so are our new men lawless also, and submit to none but their own fancy and self-judgement. Finally, as *Arius*, without warrant of the Church, interpreted Scripture as his own weak reason taught him, just so do our Sectaries: here only is the difference, That he had a plausible sound of *Scripture-words* for his heresy; Protestants have neither sound, nor syllable, nor sense through the whole Bible for one article of Protestancy, as *Protestancy*. This I shall make good hereafter.

Here is charge enough drawn up against them; but by what satisfactory known and *received Principles*, which force reason to acquiesce (and we make a search after these) they can acquit themselves, or rationally answer, is a heavy difficulty. I'll tell you in a word (and remember it) they shall

never answer by any thing that hath the look of a rational *proof*, or a *received Principle*. No: Their own sole *proofes* word, wheron the whole machin of Protestancy is built, upholds what ever they teach: They have no more. They say, 'tis true, they left the ancient Roman Church, because it left it self, but yet stick close to the Primitive Doctrin. Observe it: They are here both Accusers of us, and Iudges in their own cause. Their *proofes* word doth all, without reducing it to any known or certain owned Principle. Not one Council, not one Canon, no ancient Tradition, no consent of Fathers can they produce, wherby particular men are lycensed to rise up against an Ancient Mother Church, and condemn it of false Doctrin. They will tell you, that they stood all alone when *Luther* rose up, yet taught, forsooth, the true Gospel of *Iesus Christ*: and we must believe them. Here is the last *Propositio quiescens*. They say so: To what we charge against their uncom-missioned Authority to preach as they did, you have the like uncom-missioned answer: The Lord sent them abroad, and the Truth they taught secures them. But of these weak wordy replies I have said to much in this short Digression.

Let us now retourn to *Mr. Poole*: And I must say,

say, all he hath vented in his *Nullity or Appendix* against us, comes to no more, but to a most weak assault of a feeble Adversary; for this man, who endeavors to prove that both Church and Councils, and what else you can mention, are fallible, can never assume to himself, or eye to any Community he joyns with the Spirit of Infallibility: For, if the infallibility of the Church of *Rome* must down; down, say I, also with the infallibility of the Protestant Church, of the Grecian Church, and of all other Societies of Christians. With some of these *Mr. Poole* is lifted, and therefore I cannot but hold him, and his Adherents, men of no more, then of a fallible Religion. Hence I argue: Suppose, which is utterly false, that the Church, or all Churches, all Councils, all Fathers are fallible, and that Christian Religion (as it is taught by these) is likewise fallible: Admit also, that I were to embrace one of these many fallible Religions, (which I shall never do) will not prudence dictate, if I have no other certainty then these meer uncertainties to rely on, that it is better to hold where I am, and stick to my ancient Religion, glorious with innumerable Martyrs, Doctors, Confessors, &c. then to give up my Faith to *Mr. Pooles* post-nate fallible Religion, and false discours? How therefore can this man so much

as

as once endeavour, to draw me, or any, of my more ancient and universal Religion (though supposed fallible) to another new one, which lyes sick of the same disease, totters, and reel's as much as mine (if not more) and in a word is fallible? Of two evils the lesse is to be chosen. It is an evil without doubt, to have no Religion certain; yet, if I were to choose one of two uncertain Religions, and could by no certain *Teacher* learn which of them is *worse* (being both naught) I would either pitch where I list, and as my fancy lead's me; or rather choose none at all, knowing wel, that a ruin of all Faith, followes the renouncing of certainty in Religion. But of this more hereafter. In the interim,

I would know of *Mr. Poole*, whether this strange and unheard of Proposition: *Christian Religion, as it is taught and delivered by all Pastors, Doctors, &c. is fallible, be subjectively in him that speak's it, an infallible Assertion, or fallible?* If the first, we have an English Pope (I mean *Mr. Poole*) who without either *Scripture, Church, or Council*, can speak infallibly in matters of Faith. If that formal Proposition be fallible, it fall's of it self, without further proof, to nothing, and renders this sense: I. M. P. say by a fallible Assertion, that Christian Religion is fallible; which feeble Assertion (and the weaker it

THE INTRODUCTION. 9

it is, the worse it is for him) cannot at all startle me, or any, who upon the Authority of thousands more learned than he (to say no more) hold one Religion, and but one only, certain and infallible. Perhaps he will say, that though his Proposition be fallible, yet it is highly probable against the pretended Infallibility of the Roman Church, no other Society of Christians laying claim to infallibility. Mark by the way what this Adversary drives at. It is to tell the world a word of comfort, viz. That *Christ Iesus* hath now no certain and infallible Religion taught or learned in the whole Christian world; And to make this most fallible and false Proposition good, he back's it by another of his own, as false and fallible, viz. *It is at least highly probable, that the Church of Rome is fallible.* Pray you on what leggs doth this high supposed probability stand? I'll tell you, it stands only on *Mr. Pooles* weak thoughts, and unwarranted word, more you have not. For, never did any ancient Council, or universal Tradition, or the unanimous consent of Fathers hold it a thing highly probable, that either Christian Religion, or the Catholik Church of *Rome* is fallible. Doth the Scripture favour any where this wild Assertion? No, not one syllable is found to that pur-

B

pose,

pose, we have texts enough to the contrary; some I shall quote on a fitter occasion.

You will ask what then is it, that *Mr. Pooles* proves against us in the fourth Chapter of his *Nullity*? I answer, just nothing. His whole strain is thus: After much tampering with those convincing places of holy Scripture, usually alledged for the Churches Infallibility, and spoiling all with his fallible fancies, he goes negatively to work, and tell's us: Such and such texts (turned out of their genuine sense by his glosses) come not home, nor prove any Church infallible; and it is no wonder, for, as perverted by him, they are none of Gods Scripture, but his own scribbled whimsies. Take here one instance for many, that text of *S. Paul*, *1. Tim. 3. 15.* where the Church is stiled *the pillar and ground of Truth*, seem's plain enough, open, and significant for the Catholik sense. Now comes *Mr. Poole* with his glosses, *page 86.* and saith perhaps, here may be an Ellipsis, of the word *ἡ*, *ἡ* *ἐκκλησία* may be writ for *ἡ ἐκκλησία*; and if so, *Timothy* was the pillar, not the Church. Again, The Church here spoken of, may be that wherein *Timothy* was placed, not the Roman. 3. The term of pillar, notes the solidity, not the infallibility of the Church. 4. It may note the Churches Duty, not her practise with a
long,

long, &c. Observe wel. Vpon these wretched fallible suppositions *Mr. Poole* seem's to conclude, that those words are unconcluding for the Infallibility of any Christian Society. Put I ask by what Authority must I suppose his Ellipsis, or that the Church spoken of was *Timothy's* Church, not the Vniversal? That the term *pillar* notes not the Infallibility, &c? Doth God speak thus in Scripture, or rather doth not *Mr. Poole* vent these wild Fancies without Scripture or any unquestioned Authority? This later is most evident; And can he think by such farfetched glosses, either to rob the Apostle of his plain obvious sense, or to make me believe that his guesSES hit right on Gods true meaning, delivered in this text?

If he reply, the meaning may be as he guesSES. I answer, and it may not be as he guesSES, Who is here to judge between us? Who can tell me, that *Mr. Pools May be* is a prop sure enough to build my faith upon? He is therefore to shew positively by a *Propositio quiescens*; that is, by some cogent proof and undoubted Authority, that *S. Pauls* words must be understood as he glosses, and consequently is obliged to make good some one of these desperate Propositions. *Christ Iesus hath now no infallible Religion taught or learned in the Christian*

world. All Christian Societies are fallible. That holy and universal Church, mentioned in the Creed, is fallible, &c. But to wave such proofs, to lay hold on a Text in Scripture, and torture it as he pleaseth, and after the misusage to tell us, the Text proves nothing; is only to sport with Gods Word, and say, that Scripture made *no Scripture* by whole heaps of fallible glosses, is proofless. The foundation is good, but the superstructure is naught. Give me the strongest place in Scripture for any Article of Christian faith, I can by piddling at the Text with unevindenced glosses, both so pervert and poyson the words, that at last they speak hæresy. Yet on such unproved conjectures Protestant Religion stands, and can never have better footing, while Gods unwritten Word is rejected, and no infallible Teacher is allowed of, that learn's us Truth.

One word more, and I end. Had those two Gallants, *Luther* and *Calvin*, when they took upon them to reform the darkned world of Popery, thus allarm'd their Hearers. My Masters: We Preach indeed a new Gospel upon the best conjectures we are able; but you must know, that all we say is fallible: How sick would such a saying have made the strongest stomach amongst them? For, if fallible, if uncertain Doctrin, it was none
of

of *Christ Iesus* Doctrine, and therefore stood in need of a more pure refining. And how know our Protestants, but that yet a new sort of People may start up, and make it their task to reformat all the fallible Reformers, that have troubled the world since *Luthers* dayes? Had I no other just exception against our Protestants but thus much only, That they yet know not where about They are in their reformation, and because fallible, can never know, whether for example the thing they have in hand, be yet a meer *Embrio* of Religion, or of a more perfect shape, a new layd egg, or a hatcht chicken; whether they themselves are yet only Novices, Proficients, or Masters in the trade of Reformation; I say, were there no more, This alone would fright me from ever being Protestant.

Believe it, the Professors of an uncertain and endles reformatable Religion shall never come to settlement, till they renounce the cheat and Believe as the Apostle teaches, *ad Gal. 1. 8. Licet nos, &c. Although we, or Angel from heaven preach otherwise to you then we have preached to you, let him be accursed; which is fully to say: Believe him not.* And here by the way observe, how destructive these words are of an uncertain and fallible teaching, in matters of Religion; for admit (which *Mr. Poole* grants)

B 3

that

that all Christian Communities, all Councils, all Fathers, all Tradition, &c. deliver only Fallible Doctrin, (that is, Doctrin lyable to errour) I only may not, but am obliged to disbelieve this Truth of *S. Paul*, and believe him, or, an Angel sent from heaven, if either of them preached contrary to this fallible Learning. Why? Doctrin that is fallible may be false; but the preaching of an Angel sent from heaven cannot be false, and therefore is more certain then Christian Doctrin, that may be false. But I am obliged to quit the lesse certain Doctrin, for the most certain preaching of an Angel; *ergo* I must relinquish Christianity, if an Angel preach against it. The reason is. The lesser light yeilds to the greater, probability submits to certainty, and my fallible (though highly probable) Assent cannot but yeild to the infallible Assertion of an Angel, if he speak contrary to it.

These few considerations premised, we must insist more largely on this subject; and demonstrate that there are living and infallible Teachers of Religion in some one Society of Christians or other; which is directly opposite to *Mr. Poole*, who holds, That no men are so highly privileged by Almighty God, as to have *subjective infallibility*, or, to teach infallibly; though, perhaps, they may deliver

THE INTRODUCTION.

liver truth (as it were by chance) but not *infallibly* as Teachers. I say, as Teachers, for by what I can learn by Mr. Poole and other Protestants, They think all done when they tell us, That the *objective* Doctrine delivered in Scripture is infallible, (which yet they cannot know without an infallible Teacher, and therefore in saying this, they speak only fallibly :) but admit they know so much, they are never the better for it, unless they joyntly own some Oracle, some certain Master, who by Divine assistance interpret's Scripture without error, and as exactly convey's into our hearts Gods written revealed Verities, when any doubt ariseth, as if the Apostles taught us. These Teachers are they (can we find them out) that circumscribe our ranging Fancies, and put a limit to our swerving Thoughts, while we often read, and seldom understand those great secrets which God hath layd up in the book of Scripture, without them (as we see by too sad experience) our weak reason, and strong Fancies pervert all, and produce monsters of heresies out of Scripture it self, wherof more hereafter.

THE

THE
FIRST DISCOVERS
OF
INFALLIBLE TEACHERS,
AND
THE MOTIVES
OF CREDIBILITY.

THE FIRST CHAPTER.

*There Are infallible Teachers of true
Christian Religion.*

BEfore I prove the Assertion, I would gladly learn of our Adversaries (who make all men fallible) whether, for these thousand years, the world ever had in it any Christians, who heard the infallible Doctrin of *Christ* truly taught, and infallibly believed it? If they disown such infallible Believers, they must joyntly deny all infallible Faith, and consequently say, That though God hath revealed in Scripture innumerable Verities, yes, and for this end, to beget

beget infallible Faith in our harts, yet no man can lay hold on them, nor yeild to them by any other assent, but what is fallible, and may be false. Methinks therefore, an infallible Verity revealed to us forcibly requires an answerable and correspondent infallible assent of Faith in us : For to say, God speak's infallibly to me, and that I either will not, or cannot infallibly believe him, is in a word to tell him, that his certain Truths may ly close where they are in the book of Scripture, (they may rest there) without being layd up, or lodged in my hart as infallible *owned* and *believed* Truths. Most contrary are those golden words of the Apostle, *1. Theff. 2. v. 12.* to this wild Doctrin : *Therefore we thank God without intermission, because when ye received the word of God, which ye heard from us, ye received it not, as the word of men, but as it truly is the word of God, who (effectually) works in you that believe.* Observe well : He who receives the delivered Word of God, as it is truly Gods Word and not mans ; He that hath in his hart the infallible Word of God, and, by the cooperation of Grace, yeilds an assent to it, *as to the infallible word of God*, cannot but believe what *God speak's*, and *as he speak's* : but God speak's infallibly, Therefore he believes infallibly ; or if he reach not so high, but falters with an assent that is fallible, he Believes not God, nor his Word (as *it truly* is Gods Word) who never did nor can speak any thing *fallibly*. Now, if on the other side our Adversaries grant, that Christians heard the infallible Doctrin of *Christ*, and believed it infallibly, They also must admit of a *Subjective infallibility*, at least in such Believers. And this truth Scripture clearly points at, in these and the like undeniable places, obvious to all :

Gods infallible Revelation requires an infallible assent of Faith.

C

I know

I know who I believe, and am certain. Let the house of Israel certainly know. Although we or Angel from heaven, &c.

*Belief that
is infallible,
supposeth
infallible
Teachers.*

Faith is a conviction *ἰσχυος*, or a strong argument of *what appears not, &c.* But these I wave, because known to every one. Let us now proceed to the Teachers of Christian Religion, and prove our Assertion.

2. To go on clearly, I would know whether there have not alwayes been, now are, and ever will be among These true and infallible Believers, some Pastors, Doctors, or Teachers, who, *Authorized by Christ*, are by Duty, both to instruct Christians, in case they swerve from Truth, and also to reduce Aliens from *Christ*, to a true Belief of his sacred Doctrin? Certainly, *Mr. Poole* will own such Pastors in the world; if not, what are Ministers for in England? Or, why doth He assume to himself this Office of teaching, whilst He endeavours to reclaim a seduced Captain from his Apostacy, as he call's it? And is it possible? What? After such an acknowledgement, shall we hear this unheard, harsh, and most Heteretical Assertion: That all these Pastors, who are to unbeguile soules, may be beguiled Themselves, or teach false Doctrin? And that not so much as one, amongst them *all*, is so Highly priviledged, as to instruct with certainty? If all are fallible, and none Teaches certainly, the Blind lead's the blind, the Scholler is as good as his Master; at least, none can in prudence learn of any, if this perswasion live in him. *He that Teaches me, may as well erre as I, who am to Learn.* If an unskilful Traveller enquire the way to an unknown place of one, knowing it no better then he that asks, He travel's on with no security, and This is our very case: Amongst so many By-ways, so many mazes of
Sects

*The harsh
Doctrin of
Sectaries.*

Disc. I. C.I. *Infalible Teachers.* 19

Se&ts and Schisms, as now swarm in the world, and like cobwebs intricate thousands of souls in their journey, we are posting on as fast as Time can drive us, to a place yet unknown, a long Eternity. The directing thread, that safely drawes us out of these Labirinths, is *Sare, Firm, and infalible Faith*; we ask to learn this of our new Doctors, and not one can certainly say, *Such is the way: This infalibly is the Faith* that winds us out of errour, and most assuredly lead s to Heaven: or, if any say so much, he speaks only Fallibly.

3. And here is the summary of Protestants com-
fortles Doctrin. They have Pastors that talk, but Teach
nothing certainly: They have *Infalible Vernies* lock'd up
in Scripture, but none can open that Book, or convey
them with Assurance into mens harts: They hear God
speak, but none of them certainly knows what he sayes:
They have *Christs Promises of a Spirit of Truth* abiding
with some Christian Teachers (find them where they
can) for ever, *to the end of the world*; but now, They must
say, because all Pastors are *fallible*, That *Christ* keep's not
his word, if all may deceive, and Teach both fallible
and false Doctrin. Finally, they must own such Belie-
vers, as *S. Paul* mentioneth, *Who receive the word of God, as
it Truly is the word of God*; but have not one Pastor, or
Doctor, that dare shew his face, and say he Teaches
this word infalibly. Yet infalible *Believers* and infalli-
ble Teachers seem neer *Correlatives*; the one, if Faith
come by Hearing, staggers without the other, and
methinks when the Apostle saith, *Rom. 10. 14. None
can hear without a Preacher*, he supposeth as well the Prea-
cher (instructing) infalible, as the Hearer *infalibly in-*
structed.

*Protestants
doctrina
comfortles.*

*Infalible
Hearers of
Gods word
suppose In-
falible
Teachers,*

C H A P. II.

The Infallible Doctrine of Christ necessarily requires infallible Teachers.

1. **T**He proof of my Assertion is more fully declared Chap. 4. n. 6. and relies on this Principle. *Infallible Doctrine taught only fallibly, under that notion of fallibly taught Doctrine, is not the Doctrine of Christ. We are of God, saith Scripture, John Epist. 1. cap 4. v. 6. He that knowes God, bears us; he that is not of God, beareth us not. Hereby we know the Spirit of Truth, and the Spirit of error.* Which is to say in other Terms. He that hear's an infallible Teacher, hath the Spirit of Truth; and he that hear's not an infallible Teacher, wants this Spirit of Truth. Again, *Epist. 2. v. 9. Every one that recedes, μὴ μείνω, and remains not in the Doctrine of Christ, hath not God, &c.* But every one, that Hears only a fallible Teacher, easily recedes, and remains not in the Doctrine of Christ; Therefore he hath not God, nor the Spirit of Truth in him.

2. Upon these grounds I Argue further. *Christ Doctrine*, infallible in it self, is either now taught *infallibly* by some Pastors lawfully sent, or fallibly. If the first; we must own infallible Teachers of this infallible Doctrine. If the second, That is, if *Christs* infallible Doctrine be taught only fallibly, *ex parte Docentis*, it followes evidently, first, That though God speaks infallibly, yet no man hath certainty of what he saith. It followes secondly, That such a fallible Teaching of *Christs* Doctrine,

Disc. I. C. II. Requires Infallible Teachers. 21

Strin, may be cavilled at, and disputed against. For, *Doctrin taught fallibly may be cavilled at, and disputed against.* all Doctrin taught fallibly, and which by force of its *Proposal*, or merit of the Doctrin, may deceive and be false, is lyable to cavil, and dispute; Therefore this Doctrin may be also cavilled at, and disputed against. It followes thirdly, That really *Christs* Doctrin (perchance perverted by a fallible and false Delivery) may not be Taught at all. The reason is: No other Doctrin is, or can be taught, but what is fallible, and may be false: but *Christs* Doctrin is nor fallible, nor can be false; Therefore that Doctrin which is only Taught fallibly (as it is so delivered) is none of *Christs* infallible Doctrin. Consequently, if any man would now utterly abjure all the taught Doctrin of the Christian world, he might do it without being an Hæretick. I prove it: He who only abjures and Denies Fallible Doctrin which may be false, neither abjures nor denies *Christs* Doctrin nor any Christian Verity, which cannot be false: But all Christian Doctrin, that can be Taught (Sectaries say) is Fallible and may be False; Therefore he who Denies such a fallible taught Doctrin; denies not *Christs* Doctrin; and cannot be upon that account an Hæretick. You will say: He who Denies all Christian taught Doctrin, certainly Denies some of those *Objective Verities* which are revealed in Gods Word, and therefore is an Hæretick. Very true, if he be sure, That his Teacher delivers those Verities fallibly: But our Protestants say, Because all Teachers are fallible, none can have that Assurance from them, or any; Therefore their Doctrin, as it is taught fallibly, may be cavilled at, yes, and denied also without the guilt of Hæresy. The reason is. Whoever, only Denies the fallible Teaching of infallible Doctrin (yet not known



22 Disc. I. C.II. *Christs infallible Doctrine*

known for such) Denies not the *Objective infallible Doctrin* in it self, but the *Formal fallible Delivery of it*; and this, he may boldly say, is none of *Christs Doctrine*.

3. The substance of what I would here expresse, may perhaps more plainly be reduced to *Form* thus: A society of men, who can do no more but only Teach fallible Doctrine, *which may be false*, can assure none, that they Teach *Christs infallible Doctrine, which cannot be false*: But all societies of Christians can do no more but Teach fallible Doctrine which may be false, (for all Churches, all Councils, all Fathers, all Papists, all Protestants, and *Mr. Poole* with them, are (as they say) Fallible in their Teaching;) Therefore not one amongst them can assure any, that he Teaches or Delivers the infallible Doctrine of *Christ*. I say, *That he Teaches*; for, if we meet with a Simplician That tel's us, He builds his Faith and Religion, not upon any Preachers talk, but on the *Objective Verities* revealed in Scripture. I answer: Unless he first learn of some Infallible Oracle, what Scripture exactly speak's in a hundred controverted places, he shall never by his own poring on a Bible either arrive to the depth of God true meaning, or derive infallible Faith from those *Objective revealed Verities*. The reply supposeth, That all Truth couched in Scripture, is as easily understood, with the unelapsing of a Bible, as the sun is seen at noon-day. If so, Ministers hereafter may (for the most of men) shut their books, stop their mouths, and preach no more.

No assurance can be had from men that Teach Christs Doctrine fallibly.

Objective revealed Verities no sufficient ground of infallible Faith.

4. Some yet perhaps will say: One may preach the infallible Doctrine of *Christ*, though himself be fallible in the Delivery of it, which seem's manifest; for every Catechist, or Preacher, though he delivers the infallible

lible Doctrin of *Christ*, yet delivers it not *infalibly*; why therefore may not Ministers in England teach, as those do, infalible Doctrin, though, *ex parte subjecti docentis*, they Teach it fallibly? I answer first: Ministers in England have no Infalible Church to recurre to, in case They erre; for their whole Community is fallible. The Catholick Preacher hath a sure Oracle to rely on; an Infalible Church, that unbeguils him if he swerve from Truth, which is a mighty Advantage and a great Disparity in the present question. Now if you say Sectaries may as well rely on infalible Scripture for their Direction, as we do on an Infalible Church; I deny the *Supposition*, and shall shew hereafter, That not so much as one Article of Protestancy can be proved by Scripture. Again: No man call's into doubt the *Objective Verities* contained in Scripture, known as such: But here is the difficulty, whether the new invented Interpretations made on Scripture by Sectaries be true or false; and if false, They have no Infalible Oracle to amend the Errour as the Catholick Teacher hath.

5. I answer secondly: *S. Paul*, methinks, layes foundation enough to solve the Objection, *Rom. 10. 15. How shall They preach, unless they be sent?* Why therefore may we not assert, That every Catechist, every Preacher that hath a lawful Mission, and is sent by the Infalible Church to preach *Christ's* sacred Doctrin, if he preach that Doctrin which *Christ* and his Church approves of, is then, under that Notion of a *Member conjoynd* with an Infalible Church, Infalible in his Teaching? Though all vulgar taught Doctrin is not such. Now Ministers, who are unsent men, and therefore divorced from

The Advantage of an infalible Church.

24 Disc. I. C. II. *Christs Infallible Doctrine*

from this infallible *Moral Body*, cannot but talk, as they do, Fallibly.

Pastors
lawfully
sent teach
Infallible
Doctrin
infallibly.

6. I would not have any to mistake my meaning. Know therefore first : I do not say, That this or that Pastor, purely considered as a Pastor, is infallible in all he Teaches. Nor secondly, That either Councils assembled, or particular Bishops, are by any intrinsic *inherent quality* elevated to a state of Infallibility. But thirdly, I affirm : That God, who, according to *Christs* promise, will ever guide his Church in Truth, cannot permit All the Pastors and Teachers in it to swerve from Catholick Doctrin : For, if so, The whole Catholick Church might erre, which is contrary to *Christs* promise. Hence I say, fourthly : Every Bishop or Pastor, though not *Personally* infallible, yet when he is sent to preach *Christs* Doctrin, and complies with his Duty, That is, when he Teaches Nothing, but what he hath commission to teach in the Name of God and his Church ; such a man, I say, considered as a *member conjoynd with an Infallible Church* in the Delivery of *Christs* Verities, may be sayd to teach *infallibly* ; For upon this supposition, he doth not only speak Truth as it were by chance : (An Hzretick may do so ;) But more, as he speak's in the name of God and his Church, He teaches as the Church teacheth, that is, *infallibly*. The Reason is Manifest in Catholick Principles ; Because the Holy Ghost ever Assists some Pastors in the Catholick Church to teach true *Christian Doctrin*, and 'tis as certain that Those he Assists teach it infallibly ; Therefore a Pastor, Prelate or Bishop that Delivers *Christs* Doctrin, as is now declared, teaches Infallibly. You will say, This Pastor,

stor, or that Bishop may, through malice, ignorance, or both, swerve from Truth. I grant it; but then he teaches not as one of Gods Ministers, nor complies with *his Mission*. You will say again. Thus much at least follows out of this Principle, That a Bishop when he Teaches as *lawfully sent*, is at that instant as infallible as the Pope when he Defines in Council; or, to speak in *Mr. Pooles* homely language, hath a Pope in his belly. I answer. Every faithful Bishop may have as Infallible Faith, as the Pope: what wonder is it therefore if, when he Teaches as both Pope and the Church teach, he be then sayd to Teach *infallibly*? Yet there is a great Disparity between the Pope and particular Pastors, Bishops, &c. For no particular Bishop can make any new *Declarations* of Faith *obliging* all Christians to believe; The Pope with a Council can do so. No particular Bishop, *precisely* considered as such, is infallible; For he may Teach to day as one *lawfully sent*, and to morrow erre by ignorance, yea, and Malice also: But the Pope, considered as Pope and *Christs* Vicar on Earth can never Define in Councils but *Infallibly*; and therefore his Assistance is in a higher measure certain, and supereminently *Infallible*.

Objections answered.

7. The last ground of this Doctrin (which great Divines assert) is, That the whole Church of *Christ*, which consists of Pastors and Hearers, of Teachers and Learners, *Antecedently* to Pope and Council *Conciliarly* assembled together, is infallible; For the Promises of *Christ* ever Assisting the Church, Primarily belong to this whole *moral Body*, which cannot erre: Against *this Church* Hell gates shall never prevail, with

The whole Church consisting of Pastors &c. is infallible.

it *The Spirit of Truth shall remain for ever, &c.* Now this Infallibility cannot but remain and stand fast in the members of this mystical Body; not in Pastors only, for it avails little, that These teach infallibly, if none learn their infallible Doctrin: nor in Hearers only, because they learn not infallible Doctrin without a *Teacher*. Infallibility then accompanies both Pastors and Hearers. As therefore, These believing Hearers (conjoynd in Faith with this infallible Church) are under *That notion*, infallible, (no Catholick can deny it:) so likewise these Believing Pastors, as conjoynd in *Doctrin* with this *unerring Church*, and Teaching what the Church Teaches, under *that notion*, are infallible in their Doctrin. Yet, as. I now intimated, there is a great Difference between the *Representative Church* of a Pope and Council lawfully and *Conciliarly* assembled, and particular Pastors, Particular Christians, and Particular Churches; For, the Representative Church, because of the powerful Assistance of the Holy Ghost, cannot swerve from Truth in its Definitions; but this Pastor, that Teacher, that Particular Church may swerve (altogether cannot) though under the *notion of a Pastor sent to teach the Infallible Doctrin of Christ* and his Church, he Teaches infallibly. Separate him from this moral Body, he looeth Assistance, and cannot but teach Fallibly, though he speak Truth by chance; consequently he is none of *Christ's Teachers*, for *Christ* never impowred any to teach *Fallible Doctrin*, *that may be false*. You will say, separate a Minister from the Truth of the Gospel, and he is also no Teacher. Alas, he separat's himself; For, he hath no Mission to preach as he doth, and

How Pastors and Hearers are infallible.

Particular Pastors may erre,

Disc. I. C. 11. *Requires Infallible Teachers.* 27

and moreover Professeth that he can teach nothing *infallibly*. But of this more afterward: In the interim.

8. To cut of all reply to the Argument, I propose it thus. No man that is by nature lyable to errour, or wants God's special Divine Assistance in his teaching, and Positively renounceth all infallible Societies of Christian Teachers, can teach with certainty *Christ's* Infallible Doctrin. But all men, now at least in being, are by nature lyable to errour, want this special Assistance in their Teaching, and must (as *Mr. Poole* will have it) positively renounce all infallible Societies of Christian Teachers; Therefore no man can Teach with certainty, or deliver the Infallible Doctrin of *Christ*. The Major is evident: For he who by nature is lyable to errour, and hath not infallible Assistance to Teach infallibly, or wants the Guidance of an infallible Society to Direct him, may as easily erre and misse in his teaching, as *his right* on the Infallible Doctrin of *Christ*. The Minor is granted by *Mr. Poole*; For all Churches; whether Roman or English, Arian or Grecian, are lyable to errour, want special Assistance in their Teaching, and ought positively to renounce all Societies of infallible Christian Teachers; Therefore, the conclusion undeniably followes, which is, That none can with certainty Teach the Infallible Doctrin of *Christ*. And from hence also followes an utter ruin of Christian Religion (yea and of Scripture too) as I shall hereafter Demonstrate. For if all Pastors, all Doctors, all Teachers of Christian Religion may erre in the Delivery of their Doctrin, all Learners of it, may likewise

Men wanting infallible Assistance to teach, cannot deliver Christ's Doctrin infallibly.

28 Disc. I. C.H. *Christ's infallible Doctrine &c.*

erre in Hearing it; and if so, we have no certainty, That God is now Adored in Spirit and Truth by either, *Teacher*, or *Hearer*.

The utter
ruin of
Christian
Religion
follows
the fallible
Teaching
of it in a
whole
Church.
What all
Evangelical
Prea-
chers la-
boured for.

9. The ultimate reason, why a Total ruin of Christian Religion accompanieth the fallible Teaching of it, is thus proved. None can teach Christian Faith, that doth not Propose, or make Almighty God to be the Author of it, And therefore our Saviour, *John 7.16.* told the Jewes, That his Doctrine *was not his, but his Fathers that sent him*, Yea, The Prophets also, and all other Evangelical Preachers, chiefly laboured in this, to perswade their Hearers, that God was the Author of that Doctrine they taught. Now say I: None can Propose or make God the Author of Christian Faith, that doth not own it as a *Doctrine asserted* by his *Eternal Veracity* infallibly revealing Truth (for this is the *Formal Object* of Christian Faith;) But He that only Teaches fallible Doctrine, which may be false, deserts this *Formal Object*, and can neither own God for the Author of it, nor his infallible *revealing Verity*: *Ergo*, he must own a fallible Authority to uphold this Doctrine, which is utterly Destructive of Christian Faith. The reason will be yet more evidenced, if you propose it after this manner. A Doctrine, which by force of all the Principles it hath is meerly fallible and no more, may be false: But Christian Doctrine; *as it is Taught* by all Pastors and Ministers of the Word, &c. is thus fallible; *Ergo* it may be false: But, God never sent *Christ* our Lord, nor *Christ* his Apostles or any, to Teach a Doctrine that may be false; *Ergo* he sent none to Teach a Doctrine or Religion that is fallible. I prove it. He sent none to Teach any other

The last
ground of
this Do-
ctrine.

Do-

Doctrin, but that which is founded, and *intrinsically* relies on his Eternal infallible *Verity* revealing Truth: But such a Doctrin can neither be false nor fallible. Therefore this taught Doctrin is certain and infallible: For, to grant that God sent Pastors to teach a Doctrin which relies on his infallible Revelation, is to say, He assist's them to teach it *infallibly*.

C H A P. III.

Other proofs for Teachers, and a Church Infallible.

I. **I** Argue again thus. Supposing the promises of *Christ* made in Scripture, Gods Goodnes cannot oblige the whole moral Body of Christians to believe a falsity, or to contradict his certain revealed Verities. But if all Pastors and Doctors may erre in their Instruction, whilst they teach Christian Doctrin, God would as indifferently oblige us to believe a falsity, and contradict his certain Verities, as to hear truth when by chance it is taught, which is contrary to his Goodnes. The first Proposition is evident, and confessedly true; For our Adversaries say, it is repugnant to all *conceptions* of Gods Goodnes to require of men, under pain of Damnation, to Believe something *as infallibly true*, which is really false. The other also is as clear. For if all Pastors, all Doctors, who have the charge of souls, may (because fallible) as well Teach false Doctrin as true, as easily erre, as Deliver *Christs* pure Verities,

God cannot oblige us to believe a falsity.

Christians are, by virtue of Gods Command already intimated, bound both to hear and obey them. *Math.* 18. 17. *If he will not hear the Church*, that is, as *S.Chrysostome* expounds, *the Prelates and chief Pastors of it*, let him be to thee as a Heathen, &c. *Hebr.* 13. 17. *Obey your Prelates*, ὑπακούετε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις, *your Guides, your Leaders and Commanders*, and be subject to them; *For they watch as being, to render account of your souls.* Again, *vers.* 7. The Apostle command's us to *imitate the Faith* of these Pastors and Teachers. From these and other innumerable places of Scripture, known to all, I argue. What is possible may be reduced to Act, but it is possible, That all Pastors and Teachers may erre, and Deliver false Doctrin to the Christian world; and in case they do so, I am upon these plain expres Ordinances of God, obliged to Believe them. Therefore I must Believe them, al though they Teach false Doctrin. And if so, God obligeth me to Believe a Falsity; or, which is a real Verity, I am forced to grant this undeniable Truth, that his All-seeing providence doth now, and ever will Preserve a Church, whose Pastors and Teachers are infallible in the Delivery of Christian Doctrin. Without this certain established Infallibility in some one or other Society of Believers, Christianity is no more but a meer tottering, reeling, and uncertain Religion; yet I must listen to it, whether Those who teach it, stand or fall, that is, whether they erre or not, teach an imposture or Truth.

2. To confirm this proof, I ask whether God, after he had delivered his own certain Verities infallibly, and made also (by his Divine Assistance) Those first Masters of the Gospel, his Blessed Apostles, infallible,

ble, in their Delivery of these Verities; whether then, I say, in the ensuing ages he divorced himself from his Church, and withdrew all Special Assistance from it, or, yet continued that gracious favour to some Pastors and Doctors of a Christian society? If he continued that care and providence for the Direction of some Pastors in Truth, Those, because so guided, are still infallible in their Teaching. Contrary wise, if he abandon'd that charge, and deprived all Pastors for the Future of infallible Assistance, This woful consequence followes. That Christian Religion, once strongly supported by Gods unerring Spirit, ever since the Apostles Preaching, hath lost that Hold, and now stands tottering on no more steady ground, then what the weak, mutable, and erring Sentiments of men can afford it. Now how unmeet these are for so great a charge, *Salomon Sap. 9. 15.* sayes enough: *Cogitationes mortalium timida, & incerta providentia nostra.* The cogitations of mortal men are fearful, and our Providence vncertain; yet so it is, (and here mark the hideous crime of Protestants) who first Divorce *Christ* from his Church, and violently pull Religion from its center, which is Gods infallible directing Spirit; and then make all the taught Doctrin of Christianity, to lean and rely only upon mans weak, timid, staggering, and errable conceptions. The proof is evident; for either it relies on God, and so is infallible, or upon Humane reason, and therefore as This is various, Religion cannot but be changeable. Let then the world judge (I appeal to no other Tribunal) whether Christians can be satisfied with this comfortles Doctrin. *All they can now learn from any Christian*

*A question
proposed to
Sectaries.*

*How Secta-
ries trans-
gress.*

stian Pastor touching Religion, hath only mans weak Thought, and Reason for it; but no certain Assurance that God speaks by these Pastors, Because all, and every one of them (left to themselves) are fallible.

*Man too
feeble to
preserve
Christian
Doctrine in
its purity.*

3. I must prosecute this matter further, wherefore I say this Truth boldly. It is above mans power and policy (weak and errable in his Conceptions) constantly and unchangably to support, or carry on Age after Age the profound Doctrine of *Christ* in its Primitive purity, without Divine *Assistance*. Wit alone (dazeled as we see in the search of the most obvious things in nature) is insufficient, either rightly to Penetrate these high Mysteries of grace, or with certainty to convey them unto us in that exact sense, as God once delivered them. The reason hereof is

*Because of
its sublime
Excellency.*

drawn from the *sublime Excellency* of Christian Religion, which being (as all know) a Doctrine of Gods own incomprehensible Wisdom, a Communication of his deepest Secrets, cannot but transcend the force of humane knowledge; it cannot but lye, as it were, in a region above the reach of weak Reason only, and stand at a great distance from our fallible Discourses. Whence I argue thus. All light and knowledge, which flow from a fallible Power and capacity, cannot but be answerable to such a capacity, *id est, Deficient, uncertain, and Fallible*: But all the light and knowledge, which Christians now have from either Church or Pastors, concerning this sublime Doctrine of *Christ* and Gods revealed Verities in Scripture, flow, and are derived from no other, but from a fallible capacity, which is mans errable and weak understanding; and not from Gods infalli-

Disc. I. CIII. For an infallible Church. 33

fallible Assistance (who say our Protestants) hath withdrawn infallibility from the Church: *Ergo*, This taught Doctrin cannot but be *Deficient, uncertain,* and *Fallible*. Grant this, and none can prudently rely on it, none can know by any Principle, whether it be true or false, none finally can own it for *Christ's* certain Doctrin. *Fallible Doctrin is not Christ's.*

Rob therefore the Church of its proper *Dote*, which is Divine Assistance; take from it the Spirit of *infallibility*, Cancel that Truth of the Gospel, *I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy Faith fail not*; Destroy that impregnable Rock, wheron Christianity is founded, *Matt. 15. Tu es Petrus, &c.* Though all the Pastors in the world were *Salomons* for wit, *Austins* for learning, *Gregories* for vigilancy, *Chrysostoms* for eloquence; yet they would be too weak, feeble, and fallible Instruments either rightly to illuminate us (by the force of wit or Learning only) concerning those High Verities revealed in Scripture, or exactly to Preserve them in their first *candor*, without change and Alteration. Alas! might wit alone tamper with Gods Truths at pleasure, might it turn Religion into as many Forms or shapes as weak Reason often conceives, This too *unskilful Master* would, as Fancies and judgements are various, now build, now destroy, now add, now subtract, now make, now marr, and bring in more confusion into Christianity, then the wisest men are able to redresse. *Wit alone too weak to tamper with Religion.* And

4. Thus much we see evidently, not only in the old Philosophers, who, led on by their weak Discours and guesses, grossly mistook in their Opinions concerning Beatitude; but in some learned Fathers also (witness *Tersullian* and *Origen*.) For, These two great wits of the *Man with the cause of error.* *Examples of it.*

E

world,

Gods special Assistance preserves his Church from error.

world, because they left the Guidance of the Church, and relyed too much on their private Judgements, fell, as we know, into deplorable errors. But most of all this misery is visible in all condemned Hæreticks, as *Arians*, *Pelagians*, and *Nestorians* (witty and learned enough) but Because wit too boldly entred into Divine Mysteries, and meddled with matters above its strength, these men lost themselves; and here was the sole cause of their Ruin and falling from Truth. Whence I conclude contrary to Protestants (who have nothing to support Religion but their own weak and errable Conjectures) That unles Gods gracious Providence particularly Protect his Church, and by special Assistance Preserve it from error; The very best of us all (though never so learned) left to our weak conjectures, and fallible Discourses, might most easily become *Arians*, *Nestorians*, *Pelagians*, *Protestants*, *Socinians*, now Christians, now no Christians, or what you will. Protestantcy, and all Hæresy, which stand topling on no firmer ground then meer conjectures are, lead the way to these Downfalls, to no Religion, or any Religion, as Fancy best likes.

Gods Providence over his Church.

5. To prevent therefore this great Evil, the wise Providence of God (who well foresaw mans weaknes and Instability) first Delivered his own eternal Truths infallibly; (none doubts of this.) Next, he caused these Truths to be taught infallibly by the first Masters of the Gospel, his chosen Disciples; here of also there is no doubt with our modern men. Moreover, Because his real Intention was, That not only the Primitive Christians, should exactly receive those revealed Verities from infallible Teachers; but others also in ensuing

Disc. I. C. III. *For an infallible Church.* 35

fuſing ages (for All ſouls were providently cared for) His infinite Goodnes eſtabliſhed a viſible Catholick Church, whoſe Head and Paſtors, guided, not by humane wit or Policy, but by Aſſiſtance derived from the Holy Ghoſt, ſhould, by virtue of ſo ſpecial grace, Teach Truth infallibly, and preſerve poor ſouls from error to the end of the world. Without this Addition of a perpetuated *Aſſiſtance*, as well in order to the Later, as firſt Believers, providence would not have done its work compleatly, Chriſtianity ere this day (too unſteadily built) would have fallen to Ruin, and as often altered from it ſelf in the ſpace of 1667. yeares, as our Sectaries have done in this laſt hundred. A more ſpiteful Blow therefore cannot be given to God, a greater Chimæra cannot be thought on, then to grant, as Sectaries do, that his All ſeing wiſdom firſt founded a Church upon infallible Teachers, and next to ſpoile all with this ungodly Aſſertion, viz: *Afterward, when Chriſtians as much ſtood in need of infallible Paſtors for their Direction (becauſe of emergent Heresies) then it was, He withdrew Aſſiſtance from them,* Abandoned his charge, and left a whole Church to the wavering, timid, and uncertain Sentiments of meer erring men, who altogether, becauſe by nature fallible, might as eaſily (without this ſuperiour grace of infallibility) have taught groſſe errors, as the Verities of Chriſtian Religion. This ſequel follows from our Proteſtants Principles, where you ſee enough (I ſay it once more) of their great ſin and Hzeſy,

*Preſerves
Chriſtianity from
ruine,*

C H A P. IV.

Replies to these Arguments are answered.

1. **O**ne perhaps may be. God surely will never permit all the Pastors of Christianity to erre and deceive the world : at least this is no Consequence, They may erre, *Ergo* they do and will actually erre, for many things may be, which never will be. I answer, and many things actually happen, which were never suspected would be : and why may not this diffused Errour be one of them, who knows the contrary? In Protestants principles we have the greatest Presumption imaginable for this actual errour of all : For, they say, That ample and ancient Church of *Rome*, and all condemned Hæreticks with it erred : set then these aside, it is impossible to design plainly such Christian Teachers as never *de facto* erred. 2. The very possibility (yes and facility also) of All falling into Errour, makes the actuality of it fearfully doubtful, now men had been mad to loose both Lives and Goods, to dye ignominiously on Gibbets, for any doubtful and uncertain Doctrin. The Apostle put other thoughts in the primitive Martyrs hearts, other words in their mouths : *Scio cui credidi, et certus sum.* I know who I believe, and am certain. No Hearers therfore, can certainly rely on any doubtful and uncertain Religion.

*Answer to
Objections.*

2. The

2. The second reply. Admit that all Christian Pa-
 stors teach erroneous Doctrin, yet no great mischief
 followes; for Those who hear them are either con-
 scious of the Falsity; And if so, they are not to be-
 lieve their Teachers, or, They erre *invincibly*, which is
 a blameles Errour, and Therefore cannot in justice be
 held an Offence. The first part of the Reply sup-
 poses some instructed Christians wiser then all their
 Teachers together, which is an Impertinency never
 heard of. The second touches not the difficulty; for
 here we blame not such as may, perhaps, invincibly
 erre; But say, That the blame goes higher, and is
 unworthily cast on God, who obliges Christians to
 believe the Pastors of a *Catholick Church*, and yet gi-
 ves them such disabled ones, that all of them may erre
 universally, and teach Doctrin contrary to his revealed
 Truths. Here lyes the mystery of iniquity, upheld
 by Protestants, and the ugliness of it appears in this
 wretched Assertion: *God will have me so believe a Catho-
 lick Church; yet this whole Catholick Church, that is all the
 Pastors, all the Councils, all the Fathers, Doctors and Pre-
 lates of this Church, may teach me such false Doctrin as God
 never intended I should learn.* They may, if fallible,
 teach us, that *Christ* is not God, that Heaven is not
 a place of Eternal Happines, nor Hell an abode of E-
 ternal torments: Such Hæresies have been spread by
 Those who went under the name of Christians; and
 why may not, I beseech you, all Christian Pastors
 abuse the world as much, if Gods gracious ordinance,
 concerning the Churches infallibility, faill us?

3. A third reply: It is one Thing to teach Truth,
 and another to teach it *infallibly*: Put therfore the ca-
 se,

E. 3.

fe,

Second Re-
ply.Protestants
Mystery of
iniquity.They cast
blame upon
God.Teaching
Truth in-
fallibly.

se, That Almighty God foresaw from Eternity, that though all Pastors of the Church, *potentiâ antecedente*, antecedently might erre, yet some at least, *ex suppositione consequenti*, or, *consequently*, would not erre, but teach Christian Verities faithfully. Suppose, I say, only thus much. We have sufficient Assurance of Truth actually taught in the world, without that Previous infallible Assistance we plead for, which seems here useles; for if either man or Angel Delivers a Verity, it matters nothing, whether it arise from a Fallible or infallible cause. Our Faith therefore hath strength enough, if it rely on Truth actually Taught, though the Teacher wants infallibility. I answer: If God foresaw, that all the Pastors of his Church would not erre or teach false Doctrin, This Verity is either revealed to Christians; as a *Divine Truth*, or no: if not, we make that revealed, which is not revealed, and consequently can ground no Assurance on it: if it be revealed and known to us, this very Revelation, *viz: All the Pastors of the Church shall not erre*, is an undoubted Principle, which, assented to by true Faith, is our Security, Because such a Faith supposeth the contrary *Actual error* of all essentially excluded by virtue of Gods Revelation; For it is impossible that God tell us this Truth. *All the Pastors of my Church shall not erre in any age*, and yet, in *sensu composto* of this Revelation permit them to erre universally. Observe in one Instance the security we have by force of such a Revelation.

4. Suppose, that God had revealed to *Isaac*, that his Father *Abraham* would not sacrifice him, and withall, that *Isaac* firmly believed that Verity; He had been
been

been as indubitably secured from dying at that time, as if *Abrahams* hands had been tyed in chains, or wholly made impotent to give a fatal blow. Now mark the Application. As Gods Eternal Prevision of *Abrahams* not taking *Isaacs* life away, Antecedently supposed the cause thereof actually also foreseen (antecedently, I say, in a foregoing *signe of nature*) so likewise it is in our present case, when from Eternity he knew, that all the Pastors of his Church would not actually err, and revealed this Truth in time; His All-seeing wisdom Previously, *pro priori signo rationis*, foresaw also the total cause of their actual *not Erring*, which cause (as I have already proved) was not the power of mans weak, variable, and mistaking Reason; But the most certain Principle of Gods special and Divine Assistance. When therefore God (as the Objection supposeth) revealed that *Verity, All shall not err*, he did not only, by virtue of his Revelation, impossibilitate the contrary universal error, but warranted more, that, all of them, because prevented by special Assistance, could not erre. And this is what Scripture Energitically tells us, of *Hell gates not prevailing against the Church*, of *Christs Being with the Church to the end of the world*; wherof more hereafter. In the interim you see; that Christian Faith doth not only rely on a meer contingent (or hap hazard) Delivery of Truth; but on Truth, taught by an Assisted and infallible Oracle, which All must assert, or grant, that although *Christ* himself, by a supposed Impossibility, had been fallible in his Preaching, or the Apostles likewise fallible in Their writting Scripture, and only (because lyable

Christian Faith relies on Truth taught by an Infallible Oracle. No certitude of Truth had Christ,

to

and his
Apostles
taught it
Fallibly.

to error, had delivered Gods Verities contingently, by chance, Christian Religion might yet have stood as firme and unshaken as now it is, which is a horrid, and an unheard of *Heresy*.

5. A fourth reply : We cannot prove by good reason (if we set aside some ambiguous Passages of Scripture, which only seemingly say the contrary) that the immediate Proponent of true certain Christian Faith (Catholiks say 'Tis the Church) ought to be certain and infallible. It seems enough, say some, that this Faith be taught upon a rational Evidence, which Evidence, finally resolved, comes to no more but to a *Moral certainty*. These (as I am informed) ground themselves on this Principle, That all the Assurance we can have of Christian Religion, hath for its whole Foundation *moral Certainty* only, and it seems a prop firm enough to support it. More it cannot have.

Divine
Faith must
have an
infallible
Teacher.

6. The Objection contains two parts. To the first I answer : If Divine Faith be in the world, Reason convinceth, that the object of it be propounded by a Certain and infallible *Teacher*, and then most, when Points fundamental lye under Dispute, and are in controversy. Faith therefore requires two things essentially, (to omit other Necessaries) an Object, which is Gods *Revelation*, and a Proposition of this object made by some Teacher to Christians, which Doctrine the Apostle ratifies, *Rom. 10. 15. How shall they hear without a Preacher*. By virtue of this *Proposition* (whether we call it Cause, or an Essential Condition) the Elicite Act of Faith followes in a Believer, and intellectually layes, as it were hold, both on Gods Reve-

Revelation and the Thing revealed. Observe now well. Gods Revelation (none doubts it) is certain and infallible. Divine Faith, which resteth on this Motive, and proceeds from Grace, is also certain and infallible. The only Difficulty remaining, concerns this *Proponent* of Faiths Object, and it is, whether He that Directs me, and endeavours rightly to settle my Faith upon Gods infallible Revelation, do his work with assurance, fallibly, or infallibly.

7. I say first. Gods infallible Revelation avail's nothing in order to Faith, unles Christians by their Faith lay hold on the Certainty therof, or own it as infallible, and the assured ground of their Assent. The reason is. Because God speaks infallibly to Christians for this End, That his infallible Word may have influence into Faith, and support in with Certainty. If therefore this revealed Word be not Certainly Proposed (as it is) infallible, if it be not due-ly applyed to a Believers understanding, under its own Notion of certainty, that strength of infallibility lyes as it were dead, without Operation, and profits Belief no more, then Food doth a Body into which it cannot enter. The similitude is fit: For as Food, though apt to strengthen a Body, is just as if it were not, unles it be due-ly Applyed; so Gods Certain Revelation, though most Proportionate to strengthen a Soul in Faith, yet in order to this Effect, it looseth all Efficacy, while a due Application of its *infallibility* is wanting.

*The object
of Faith
must be in-
fallibly ap-
plied.*

8. To illustrate more this necessary Truth; I say secondly. When a Revelation lyes darkly in Scripture, as it often doth in High points of Controversy,

F

accor-

42 Disc. I. C. IV. *Replies to Arguments*

Gods Revelation is received according as 'tis propounded.

according to the measure or degrees of Certitude, which the Proponent of Faith gives to the Revelation, and faith, *God speaks thus*, An Assent answerably follows with like Certitude in the Hearer, and not a stronger. If therefore the Proponent only say Doubtfully, *I think God speak's as I preach, but am not Certain; Doubtful also is the Assent given to this Preaching.* If he say, What I teach is Probable, *The Assent can be no more but Probable.* If finally He truly say, *I teach Infallibly what is revealed, the Assent Answers, and is Infallible.* The reason is clear. For, as no Eye can see Colours in darknes before light makes them visible, yea, and according to the measure of light it see's them: so no Intellectual Eye can discover a *dark Revelation*, before he borrow light from his Teacher, and as The light is lesse or more, so He see's that object lesse, or more perfectly. A dubious and uncertain *Proposal* therefore, made of a *certain Revelation*, when it doth not Clearly manifest it self, is like a *glimmering light*, And neither doth, nor can apply the *Objective infallibility* Therof with Assurance to mans intellectual Faculty, which yet seek's after Certainty in matters of Belief. This needs no proof. For he who proposeth only Doubtfully a Revelation, which is Certain in it self, both in *actu signato*, and *exercito*, faith no more but *timidly* thus much: Perhaps *I declare what God speak's*, and perhaps *I do not*; For my Declaration only Doubtfully guesses at the Certainty of the Revelation, And it is against the nature of all Doubt to convey Certainty into any understanding. As long therfore as the *infallibility* of a Revelation stands remote from me, For want of an undoubted Application made

A timide proposal of Divine Revelation begets no more but a doubtful Faith.

made by an *infallible Proponent*, it can no more trans-
fuse Certainty into Faith, then fire, at a great distan-
ce, warm, That is, no more *Then if it were not Cer-
tain in it self, or not at all in Being*. Whence I con-
clude. That a certain Revelation (if obscure in Scri-
pture) requires a Certain Proposition, Because It
little avail's me to know this truth, *That if God speak's,*
he speak's infallibly, unles, hic & nunc, in these circumstan-
ce when he speak's to me for my Salvation, I yeild my cer-
tain Assent to the infallibility of his Word, which cannot
be done, unles I have Assurance from my Teacher,
that he speak's (as I ought to believe) *infallibly*.
Upon these undeniable Principles I say, thirdly. Our
Sectaries can do no more but doubtfully guesse at
what they Believe, and consequently (as Protestants)
never yet had, nor can have Divine, certain, and in-
fallible Faith. I prove the Assertion. All Faith,
which hath no other Certitude, then what is derived
from Those, who propound the object of it (*id est*,
Gods Revelation) *uncertainly and doubtfully*, is no mo-
re but *wavering, Opinative and doubtful*. But the
Faith of Protestants is evidently such, Because no
man, or Society of men amongst them, can without
doubt and fear infallibly say: *God speak's as I preach, and*
I infallibly preach as God speaks; For, if he averr thus
much with Truth, he Propound's the object of his Faith
infallibly, and therefore is so farre infallible. If he do
not, his preaching must be finally resolved into his
own timid, weak, and wavering Opinion, which
weighed, comes to no more but this Levity. *I hope*
well, and think I preach what God hath infallibly Revealed, yet
am not certain, because all I say, (for ought I know) is
fallible.

Sectaries
can have
no Divine
Faith.

They can't
not propose
Faith in-
fallibly.

44 Disc. I. C. IV. Replies to Arguments

9. If you will see this Truth farther Evidenced, do no more but ask of any Protestant, Why, for example, He believes that all the Churches on earth are fallible? That Christ is only figuratively in the Eucharist? That Faith only justifies? That there are two Sacraments and no more, &c. His first refuge perhaps will be to Scripture. But demand again. Whether Scripture in plain and Express Terms, Delivers these supposed Doctrins? If he be not more then impudent, he must say, No. All therefore he can reply, is, That the Ministers of his Church, after a perusal of Scripture, find these Verities contained there, and Propose all to him as things Certainly revealed, Therefore he believes them. Here we come to the trial of Protestants Faith, and mark well, How unavoidably They are forced to grant, *That when a pretended Revelation, is not manifest for them, But lyes (if at all) very darkly in Scripture, it must be brought to light, and made more clear by some Teacher.* Some one or other (if it have influence into Faith) must Apply it and Propose it to a Hearer, as Gods certain Word. Without this Application made by a certain Teacher, no Christian can (but most temerariouſly) admit of the Revelation, as Divine, and Certain.

*Sectaries
must own
an infal-
lible Propo-
nent.*

10. Demand therefore in the last place, Whether all the Ministers in England are able to propound certainly and infallibly the above mentioned Doctrins (darkly at least, and indeed, not all contained in Scripture) as Gods revealed Truths to any? The answer must be Negative. They cannot (for if they propose them infallibly, Ministers are infallible) Ergo, say I, none can Believe these Doctrins for Gods certain

tain Revelation, Because the *Proposal* of them (absolutely necessary to apply the Revelation) is *defective, weak, dubious* and *uncertain*. The Faith therefore, which followes upon so unsteady a Teaching, cannot but be answerably rowling, That is in one word, no Faith at all. *And Protestants have no better.*

11. Some perhaps may say : Though Protestants have no great Certainty of the Doctrins above specified, because they are neither expressly in Scripture, nor Asserted by any infallible Teacher, yet their Faith in *Fundamentals* (universally held by all Christians) stand's sure enough, and is infallible. Such Truths shall never fail, and so far the Pastors of the Church may, it is likely, be held infallible.

12. Hereafter we shall treat more largely of Fundamental points, and Therefore at present will wave what is not pertinent to answer this Reply. And pertinent it is to say first : That not one Doctrin peculiar to Protestants, (as Protestants) because neither expressly found in Scripture, nor Asserted by any infallible Teacher, can certainly be believed upon *Divine Revelation*. That these Sectaries teach not their own Protestant Tenents infallibly, is granted. That Scripture doth not in *express Terms*, without intolerable glossing, deliver one of them, shall be made, after a few pages, most evident; And thus, if this last Reply be to any purpose, it brings Ruin to that part of Doctrin which is called *Protestancy*. I say secondly, There is scarce one Article of *Christs* Sacred Doctrin, so clearly expressed in Scripture, which may not, would men take the liberty, as Sectaries do, by wilful Glosses to alienate it from the Churches sense, be perverted.

*Why Do-
ctrine of
Protestants
is Protest-
ants is
uncertain.*

46 Disc. I. C. IV. *Replies to Arguments*

*Doubtful
words of
Scripture,
separated
from the
sense of an
Infallible
Interpreter,
ground not
Faith.*

*The
Church in
all her Do-
ctrines
equally
infallible.*

*The
Church is
Christ's
School.*

Arians have taught them this mode of Glossing, and they exactly follow it. Separate therefore the words of Scripture from the *Sense of an infallible Interpreter*, we can Believe nothing, we have no more but a *body without a Soul*, guesses *without certainty*. And upon such uncertainties the whole Faith of Protestants doth and must rely, which is deplorable. And here ask them, when They appeal (as They ever doe) to Scripture, What they mean by Scripture, which needs Interpretation, even in Points most Fundamental. Must we admit of their Interpretation? Why so, more then of others as learned as They? Why not as well on the present Churches Interpretation? This is as good (to say no more) as their fallible Guesses are. But of this Subject hereafter. I say thirdly. Never any Catholick Church hitherto held it self infallible in a few Fundamental Doctrins, and not in others. Therefore Protestants are more insolently bold, whilst they attempt to make this Distinction, then ever any Church yet was. What? That meer fallible Men shall be my Doctors, and *ex tripode* define, So far the Church holds infallible Doctrin, But no further, T'would be well nigh *eight Degrees* of madness in me, to believe them. Admit once of this: A new Hæretick may step out, and defend as stoutly, yea, and upon as solid grounds, that Scripture it self it not infallible, but only in a few Fundamental Matters, yet unknown to the world. If you say this sounds too harshly, and cannot be granted. Parallel I beseech you, your own wild Assertion with it, and se whether that runs much smother. Thus it is. *Christ hath erected a School, which is his Church, where*

where Christians are to learn his Sacred Doctrin: But when they come to it, They find more then the half of its Doctrin doubtful, fallible, unsound, uncertain. Alas! Aristotle's or Plato's School can afford us Topicks, and uncertainties enough: I hope Christs School can learn us better. Fourthly. Were the Church falsely supposed Fallible in the delivery of some Doctrin lesse Fundamental, it would be much safer to believe it, then Protestants, who may err in all they say, And then most, when being void of proofs, They stand trifling with a Distinction of *Fundamentals*, and not *Fundamentals*. Herein as in all other things, they are most fallible, and must I, think ye, credit men, that can say nothing certainly?

13. Fifthly, and I end: Admit once of a Church with this half infallibility in fundamentals; our Sectaries, who so furiously oppugn that whole infallibility which we ascribe to the Roman Church, must Answer their own Arguments against us. For here we question them, as they do us. *Where or in what Subject is that partial infallibility lodged? What Pastors designable are endued with it? How shall we make our Addresses to them in doubts and difficulties, if none know where, or who they are? What kind of infallibility is this? By whose assured Testimony can we learn what is de fide fundametalis, what not? What if these Pastors be divided amongst themselves in their Decisions of fundameetals, whose judgement is finally to be stood too, &c.?* These and the like Questions, most easily answer'd by Catholicks, when They give an account of their Belief (as I shall shew in the Resolution of Faith) press so strongly upon Protestants, that not one of them shall

*Rational
Queries
made to
Protestants.*

48 Disc. I. C. IV. *Replies to Arguments Answered.*

*Protestants
pretence to
a private
Spirit.*

shall ever have a satisfactory Answer. Perhaps to solve them, some will recurre to the private Spirit, and say, This tell's them all Truth in these doubts. *Contra.* Ask only here : Whether this Spirit *makes them or their Pastors infallible*, or can direct others to find out such infallible Pastors? If they reply : Those are such, as Teach Gods Word purely ; the Answer is impertinent, for we ask whether it Assists any to Teach Gods pure Word *infallibly*, And who they are ? It may be others will say, that *Christ* never had since the Apostles time, any infallible Church on earth even in fundamentals, All therefore we have now to Direct us, is only the book of Scripture (without other Proponent) and every mans private Reason. *Contra.* It is Evident, That Scripture makes no man infallible, both *Arians* and Others read it, and yet grossly err in Points most Essential. Deny therefore a Church unerrable in Essentials, and say boldly, that as *Arians* have already erred in some Fundamentals, so others might before this day have wholly erred, and outed both *Christ* and *Creed*, with every Article of Christian Religion. For *weak Reason* alone, is insufficient to Preserve Christianity in its Purity, as I have shewed above, wherof also more hereafter.

CHAP.

C H A P V.

A word with some later Sectaries concerning Moral certainty.

1. **H**ere we come to examin the other part of the Objection proposed above, n. 5. And thus ^{Mr. Stik- lingfleet.} some later men Discours concerning the certainty of Christian Religion. They say first, (and most truly) That the *ultimate Motive* whe. on Faith relyes, is Gods infallible Testimony, with all, That none can question the infallibility of this Revealed Testimony, when it is *Sufficiently proposed*, and made known to us. The only Question therfore is, How it comes to be made known, or, discovered in order to those things which are immediatly Revealed. They say secondly. *Moral certainty may be a sufficient foundation For the most* ^{Protestants Doctrine about Mo- ral Cer- tainty.} *firm assent, if the matter to be believed, be the infallible Truth of a Doctrin, upon futable Evidence. Though we have now but Moral Certainty of that Evidence. The Assent may yet be firm to such a Doctrin, as infallible.* They say thirdly: Moral Certainty may be as great as *Mathematical and Physical*, supposing as little reason to doubt in moral things as to their natures, as in *Mathematical and Physical*, as to *Theirs*. Here briefly is their Doctrin. Some further Explications of it, will perhaps more opportunely have place, while we make our Exception against it. And

2. My first Exception is. These Authors do not
G suffi-

Degree of
Moral Cer-
tainty.

sufficiently explain what they would have here understood by *Moral certainty*, wherein there is a great Latitude. One Degree of it excludes all Rational doubt. And thus we say: He, who never saw *Constantinople*, may yet upon the indubitable Testimony of so many witnesses, who have seen it, affirm without fear, There is, or hath been such a City in the world. An other Degree of this Certitude reaches not so high, As we see in *School Opinions*. Some Philosophers Tell you, it is Morally certain, That sublunary Bodies, as Fire and water, are composed of Matter and Form. That Accidents are really distinct from Substance and Motion; yet now there are some, that deny it, and hold, as they think, a contrary Philosophy more *Morally certain*. Therefore, when we come to apply this Moral certainty to Disputable matters, we do seldom or never agree about it. I doubt not, but These very men, we now treat with, will say (what They judge, God knowes) that, That part of Protestant Religion, wherein it differs from all Christians, is upon Moral Certainty True, yet the Rest of the world opposes them, and Avouches it hath not so much as one Degree of *Probability* for it, That therefore, which is here meant by Moral certitude; must, if these Authors speak to the purpose, be a Certainty, wherof no man can Rationally doubt. Thus much supposed.

A grand
Cheat of
Novellists
discover'd.

3. I say first, (and by this Assertion you may discover the grand Cheat of these Novellists) Christian Religion as it is *fancied*, and *variously Professed* by innumerable, who go under *that* name and *Notion*, hath so little of this Great Moral Certainty for it, *That it is*

an

an *Heresy* to Allow it a mean Probability. Why? *Arians*, *Pelagians*, *Eutychians*, *Donatists*, *Socinians*, And all other condemned *Hæreticks*, called Themselves *Christians*, and professed some part of *Christian Religion* truly; But had They, I beseech you, a great Moral Certainty For the other part of their Errours and *Hæresies*, falsely vvented by them as *Christ's Doctrin*? You wil say, No. But they had it for the *Fundamentals* of *Christian Religion*, wherof no man ever doubted, and thus much they Defend upon that Certitude. Admit of this as True, (though I hope, *Protestants* grant, That *Arians* do deny Fundamental Doctrin.) What is it to the Purpose to tell us. All condemned *Hæreticks*, and *Protestants* with them, have Moral certainty for one Part of *Christian Religion*, wherof None ever doubted; And to give us nothing of this High Certitude for the other Part, which is in Controversy, and Specifically belongs to *Protestants*? Had these men therfore come home to the Difficulty, They would not have here mispent time in Proving what needs no Proof, viz. That the General Doctrin owned by all *Christians* (as is a Belief in one God, or, of *Christ* a Redeemer &c.) Hath at least Moral certainty for it; But They should have shewed, That *Arianism*, as *Arianism*, or (which had been to the Purpose) That *Protestancy*, as *Protestancy*, stands so firmly built on High Moral Certainty, That None can prudently doubt of it. Now this They fraudulently wave, And only put us off, with a general word of the Certainty of *Christian Religion*, as if *Protestancy*, hid under that Specious name, had safety and Sanctuary enough; Or, as if it were all one to say. The part of *Christian Faith* universally agreed on is certain. Ergo *Protestancy*, as *Protestancy*, goes along with it upon equal Certitude. Alas!

These men
wave the
main
Question.

Protestants
under the
general na-
me of *Chri-
stians* per-
swade No-
thing for
*Protestan-
cy*.

This is that which only requires proof, and is the thing we Absolutely deny.

Two Reflexions made on Moral Certainty.

Moral Certainty may be False.

4. Again, (And here is my second Exception) These Authors cannot apply their Moral certainty to the Faith of any Religion, that beares the name of Christian. At least, it is neither applicable to Catholicks, nor Protestants. For proof hereof, Note first: That moral Certainty taken in what Height you please, is an Act of the Judicative Power in man, *subjectively* settled in his Mind, who hath it, And ever falls on a Determinate Object, (for in Objects, *à parte rei*, there is neither Probability, nor moral Certainty.) Every Thing imaginable being either in it self Real and Stable, or not, independent of any Moral Assertion: As is clear, For should one say now: *It is morally certain, that there is such a City as Rome in the World*; Rome is, or is not, independent of what is asserted morally Certain. Note secondly. Though the greatest Moral certainty usually excludes a rational doubt in order to what is asserted certain; yet in rigour it may be false, And Therefore ever implies some weak Degree of Fear, of anxiety, and suspicion to the contrary. Had any one said a few days before the Burning of London (little then foreseeing that sad Disaster) that, That Noble City would not in so strange a manner be consumed with fire, He would have been thought to have uttered a Truth Morally certain, yet the contrary doleful Effect proved it untrue. And the like may happen now, while we upon Moral Certainty Say, *Rome or Constantinople are Cities in Being*. These Grounds supposed,

5. I say first. Whoever, when he Affirm's, that Christian Religion is only Morally Certain, and hath for

for the Object of his Affirmation, that which Essentially constitutes Religion, I mean true *Divine* and *Supernatural Faith*; highly wrongs Christian Religion, yea, and destroyes the very *Being* and *Essence* of it. I prove it. The Certainty of Divine Faith, is as farre above, and distant from all the Degrees of Moral Certitude (which may be false) as Heaven is from Earth, and more. Therefore he who allowes no greater Certainty to true Faith then Moral, which may be false, destroyes both the *Life* and *Essence* of Christian Religion. That the Certainty of Faith farre surpasseth all the Degrees of Moral Certitude, is Demonstrable upon Principles, granted as well by Orthodox Christians, as by our Adversaries, who say, That true Faith dot not only affirm, That what God Reveales is most Certain (for thus much, supposing a God, we know by Science, were there no Faith) but by Faith we affirm without fear at all: *God speaks Thus and Thus. He reveales that the Divine Word took flesh. That Christ dyed for us. That there is a Trinity of Persons in one Divine essence &c.* Such Truths, we already own as Delivered by one, who neither can, nor will Deceive us.

Moral Certainty only destroy's the Being of Christian Religion.

Certainty of Faith farre above Moral Certainty.

6. Hence I argue. The Sole and Adequate Object of Divine and Supernatural Faith, is Gods infinite Veracity, which Actually speak's to us, and is lyable to no errour. Faith then, if it be Divine, Tend's unto no other Object, neither is the now *infused Habit* of it, though fortified with a thousand Illustrations, inabled to Rest upon any other Motive in this present State. What therefore this Infinite Veracity actually Reveals, that Faith *layes hold on*; It cannot believe more or lesse, Now I subsume. But this Infinite Ver-

G. 3 racity.

Gods Veracity trans-
fuseth more certain-
ty into
Faith,
then the
Motive of
Moral
Certainty
can do.

Faith if it
rest not on
Gods Veracity is not
Faith.

Supernatural Faith
is more Certain than
Metaphysical Science.

The Energy
of Faiths
Motive.

Veracity (when it is duely Proposed) Transfuseth more Certainty into the *Elicite Act of Faith*, Then any Moral Certainty derived from inferior Motives can have; For all Moral Certainty is at least capable of Falsity, and may deceive us : Gods infallible Veracity cannot be False, nor deceive if Faith Rest upon that Motive; And if it Rest not there, it is no Faith at all. It is therefore absolutely impossible : if God speak's, and, I Believe him as he Speak's, That all the Power in Heaven can Falsify this Act, or Separate a most High infallibility from it. Contrarywise, There is no Moral Certainty, but may, by all the Principles it hath, be false and fallible, yea, and often is so.

7. From this undoubted Ground. I inferre also, That Supernatural Faith is more Certain and infallible, then all the Metaphysical Science, which Nature can give us. It is true, Metaphysical Science hath more of the Evidence, and therefore excludes all indeliberate Fear or Doubt to the contrary (for no man can so much as indeliberately Doubt, whether a whole City be greater then one House;) But for Absolute Certainty, and Infallible Adhesion, Faith yet surpasseth it. The Reason is; Because the Infinite Veracity of God, which only supporteth Faith, Majori vi, with greater Force, Energy, and Necessity transfuseth into it a Supereminent Infallibility, supereminent, I say, and above all the Certainty, which Principles of nature can afford. As therefore this Infinite Veracity surpasseth all Created certainty, so Faith, which relies on it, goes beyond all Natural and inferior certainty. Upon this Principle we see first, How Divinely the Apostle spoke : *Lites nos &c.* Although we or Angel from Heaven preach contrary &c.

Let

Let him be accursed. And, how wel *Sr. Chrysostome* delivered himself, when He saith, *Hom. 12.* (pondering those words *ad Hebr. 11. Fides est Argumentum &c.*) That he held them more certain, then the Things he saw with his Eyes. These Truths (and great Truths They are) cannot subsist, unles Faith be stronger in Certitude, then all the Principles in Nature, and consequently farre more strong then Moral Certainty is, which may be false. Now with such an Assent the Roman Catholick Church Believes, Therefore a Faith only Morally certain Belong's not to it. If Protestants Disown it, They have no Faith, no, nor so much as a Belief Morally certain, wherof more presently. We see secondly. How the very Essence of Christian Religion is destroyed, if we make Faith no more but Morally certain; which is, what I intended to Prove.

8. Perhaps, These Authors will tell us: When they Assert Christian Religion to be founded on Moral certainty, Their Assertion fall's not immediatly upon the Assent of Divine Faith, which is firm and certain; But rather upon the Object of it Antecedently applyed to us Before we believe; wherof we can have no greater Assurance, then what is Moral. And it is no wonder; For, say They, There can be had no greater then Moral certainty of the main Foundations of all Religion, which are the Being of God, and the Soules Immortality. To quarrel therefore with Moral certainty is Madnes, when the Foudation of all Religion is capable of no more. By the way, if this be Madnes, I see very little Wisdom in some, who; to oppugne the Churches infallibility (proved as they suppose by motives of Credibility only morally certain) Ring out nothing

Religion
founded
on Moral
Certainty
confuted.

nothing but Peales of *Impossibilities*, and say it cannot be That the Assent to a matter Believed, Rise higher or stand firmer, then the Assent, which is given to the Testimony wheron we Believe. But the Infallibility of the Church is the thing Believed, upon the Testimony of Motives, at most but *Morally* certain; Therefore we cannot Believe this with a stronger Degree of certainty, then those Motives give us, which afford at most but Moral certainty. If this Discours be good, I argue thus, *Ad hominem*. No greater certainty have Christians now Antecedently to their Actual *Belief*, that God speaks to them by either Scripture or Church, then that God *is in Being*; But the very *Being of God* is only known by Moral certainty; *Ergo*, that he speaks to Christians cannot be known antecedently to *Belief*, by any greater Certitude, then what is Moral, and may deceive them. How then, I beseech you, comes the *Elicite Act* of Supernatural Faith unto such a Height of Certainty, as not to Credit an Angel, if he Preach against it? Upon what Motive stands it so firm, when no other Certainty supports it, but only what is *Moral*, and may be false? The *Medium* is fallible, Therefore the Belief founded on it is no better, but Moral and fallible. Mark well your own Argument. 'Tis thus.

9. The Motives of Credibility for Christian Faith, Because only known by Moral Certainty, cannot ground a certain Belief of any Churches Infalibility: *Ergo*, I say, The very Existency of God and his Revelation, Because only known by a *Moral Certainty*, cannot ground a firm Belief in God, or any Christian Verity, unles you say, that These Motives for Christian

stian Faith, far surpasses in Certainty all the certain knowledge we can have of Gods Existency. I know not what these men can answer. My thought is, They must make Faith a meer *Opinion*, and allow it nothing of Certainty, or *Supernatural infallibility*, Though they seemingly speak otherwise, as if Moral Certainty might be a *sufficient Foundation for the most firm assent*. Would to God they would declare themselves *intelligibly*, And say plainly, whether this firm Assent here mentioned be only of the like Nature with probable firm Opinions taught in Schools? Or contrarywise (if this firm Assent be Faith) whether it doth not Supereminently surpass the Certainty of All other obscure intellectual Operations, which Christians now have on Earth? This should be explicated, but is not.

10. Now to the Reply. Though an exact Answer cannot be well returned, without entring upon an other question (the Resolution of Faith) which here lyes out of the way, and Admits not in this Place of a full and diligent Examination. I say first. *No obscure intellectual Operation, which preced's Divine Faith, or is independent of it, can arise to those Degrees of Certainty which this Supernatural Act requires.* Admit then, that the Existency of God (which is true) can be Demonstrated by natural Reason, Admit also, that those strong Motives for Christian Religion *Antecedently* known by Humane Discours, demonstratively convince the Verity of it, yet because Faith (as I now sayd) Relyes upon a *Superiour infallible Principle* (Gods own *unerrable Veracity*) it far surmounts both these Certainties, and much more would it go beyond them, were they

An Answer to the Reply.

H known

No Science
gives the
least Degree
of certitude
to Faith,

known as *Moral Truths only*. Why? A natural Discours, wherby these Verities are known, is Science; But no science gives the last, or least Degree of *intrinsec* Certitude to Faith; and Therefore Divines say: Gods Supream Verity, which ever supports Belief, upholds it not as known by *natural Reason*; For if it did, Faith would be at last resolved into one *natural Principle* thus. *I believe God to be the Highest Verity imaginable, not Because he saith so, But because I know this great Truth Scientifically*, where you se, the last *Analysis* rest's on an *extrinsecal Principle* of knowledge, with which Faith, as *Faith*, meddles not.

Motives to
Faith ab-
solutely ne-
cessary.

11. Thus much therefore is clear. Although the Motives of Credibility manifest (as they do) most *undoubtedly*, that God speak's to Christians, yet, when we bring an Act of Faith by a true *Analysis* to its *Home and Center*, we find it ever Resting on Gods Veracity only, as the last *Stay* and most certain Motive. Notwithstanding, the *Præambulatory* Motives avail infinitely to Faith, Because they indubitably point out that Society of Christians, wherein Gods Verities are certainly taught, and make this Discernable from all other Hæretical Conventicles. In a word, They shew Christian Religion to be either evidently Credible, or as some later Divines will have it, evidently *True in Attestante*. And if this be so, the formal Object of Christian Faith is known, as it were *Scientifically*, either before, or when we Actually Believe, which seems grounded on those words of the Apostle: *Scio cui credidi, & certus sum: I know, and then believe certainly.*

12. At present I wave this Doctrin, and say secondly.

ly. It is one thing to know *Scientifically*, and another to Believe *certainly*. Both intervene in the matter now handled. Faith Prerequisites a Science, and Moreover *essentially* includes *Certainty*. Thus it is. While one of Prudence ponders those strong and pressing Motives, which (as Light doth the Sun) gloriously evidence true Christian Religion (such are *Miracles* the long continued Consent of Nations, Sanctity of life, Efficacy in Doctrin, the blood shedding of Martyrs &c.) He knows, that God cannot permit the world to be cheated into error by them. He knows, that his goodnes cannot proclaim, as it were, and publish to Christians a Religion manifested by such evident convincing Marks and Signs of Truth, and afterward Signify a *meer nothing*. It cannot be, that God speak's in so powerful a Language, and deceives us; For who can persuade himself, That all the Miracles done by *Christ* and his Blessed Apostles, the eminent Sanctity They showed, and admirable Conversion wrought by them, (open to mens eyes and senses) were *permitted like Charms* to Delude the world? Yet this followes, if either no Religion answered to these great visible wonders, or, if such palpable convincing Signs could make a false Religion as Speciously *Credible*, as Gods true Religion is. Therefore Rich. de S. Victor. lib. 1. de Trin. c. 2. with just Reason Exclaims. *Si error est quem credidimus à te decepti sumus.* If it be Error we Believe, it is you, O God, who have deceived us: and He gives this Reason, *Iis enim signis &c.* For by such forcible Sigas, the Doctrin we believe is confirmed, which could not proceed from any, but from you alone. Observe now well. Two Judgements

*Difference
betwixt a
Certain
Belief and
a Scientific
knowledge.*

*What and
how these
Motive
convince.*

Judgements upon these Signs. may ensue upon the Consideration of these exteriour Signs, which manifest Christianity. The one after this manner. God certainly Delivered his Eternal Truths by the Preaching of *Christ*, and his Blessed Apostles, who had no other Exteriour Testimony for their Doctrin but *Miracles, Sanctity, Conversions of Nations &c.* I now see, saith this prudent Man, as evidently the like *Miracles*, the like *Conversions* with great *Sanctity &c.* in the Roman Catholick Church: If therfore it was Evident that God spoke to the first Christians by the wonderful works of *Christ*; it is as Evident, that he Speaks now to me by the Still continued *Miracles* of this Church. This Discours, or Judgement, wherby he affirms, *There are These wonders, God speak's by his Church*, is not Faith; but Science; Because it Relyes on Motives, which Reason knows evidently enough. Now further. When He is thus disposed and prepared to Believe by so firm an Evidence, The other Judgement of *Elicite Faith* followes, which tend's not into the Evidence of those Motives; for if it did so, *under that Notion it would not be Faith*; For Faith, as Faith, totally Relyes on Gods Sole Revelation, and for this, as the only *Formal Object*, a Christian Believes what ever mystery is Revealed after a due Proposal; as is already Declared.

Faith and Science Tend differently.

13. Some will say. The *Elicite* Act of Faith Scientifically knowes not the Object wheron it Relyes, and therfore cannot be Certain. Answer. It is a *Catechresis*, or an Abuse in Speech to say, That either Faith, or any other intellectual operation knowes its Object; The understanding informed by these vital Acts *knowes*, if we speak properly. Yet, if we go

go on in that vulgar Language, significant enough. I say Faith, as Faith, no more *Scientifically* knows or proves its Object, then Science, as *Science*, Believes what it knows: This *proves*, That certainly *Believes*, whilst it Resteth immediately upon Gods Revelation, which is most amply proved by the Pre-ambulatory Motives now touched on. Neither can Faith *Scientifically* know or prove its Object, without loosing an *Essential Predicate*, which is *Obscurity*. All therefore, who destroy not the very Nature of Faith, must allow it the greatest Certainty under heaven, and withall grant, as the Apostle doth, that it is *Argumentum non appatensium*, of a dark, and obscure Tendency.

Faith can
no more
Scientifi-
cally prove
or know its
Object, then
Science, as
Science,
can believe
its Object.

Faith both
obscure and
certain.

14. You will reply again. The Mode then and Tendency of Faith unto its Object is here supposed Obscure, and that Previous judgement of Credibility after all possible weighing of those Motives, which do manifest the Credibility of this Truth. *God speaks by the Church*, is no more but Morally certain; *Ergo* the Belief of that Truth stands still wavering upon *Uncertainties*. I answer. If these Motives have an infallible Connexion with Divine Revelation, That is, If they clearly convince, that God cannot but *de facto* speak to Christians, after so many Signs and wonders, *The Judgement Previous to Faith, is Metaphysically certain*. However give it a lesser Certainty, we must yet say with the Prophet: *Testimonia sua credibilia facta sunt nimis*; These motives well considered, bring Reason to an *invariable State* of Believing, in so much, That none can *Disbelieve* without Sin, and Madnes. Again we must say, That Judgement

The Moti-
ves bring
Reason to
an invari-
able Sta-
te of Belie-
ving.

62 Disc I.C.V. Of Moral Certainty.

No real
proof can
weaken
his Judge-
ment.

which throughly penetrat's them, *Evacuat's both Doubts and Fear to the Contrary*, and far exceed's all Degrees of *Probability*, which gives Reason the Freedom to Alter an Opinion when Stronger Proofs come against it. But no Real Proof whatever, is capable to Overthrow the Certainty of this Judgement, though Fallacies may puzzle it. Call it then as you please *Moral* or *Metaphysical Evidence*, it hath proved its own Strength, for never Any without it, since Christianity began, either rightly believed in *Christ*, or *Church*.

15. This Judgement therfore which like an Interiour voyce (supposing the Exteriour Proposition of the Church) summon's us to hear, or, like a Light that discover's Gods own Language delivered by Revelation, makes the Language, once dark, clear enough to us. Now being thus manifested, we lay hold on it, and yeild Assent to the Revelation for *it self*, and not for the antecedent Motives. And because this Revelation is without Dispute more infallible then any Truth in Nature, it cannot but Answerably, as I said above, *impart and contribute a Stronger Certainty to Faith*, then the most evident Principles do to any Science. *Vpon this strong Fortresse then Christian Religion stands firm, which undoubtedly implies a greater Certainty then only Moral.* And I think, our Adversaries will say so too; who, though They take the Canon of Scripture upon Moral Certainty, yet they Believe the particular *Revealed Mysteries* contained in that Book, with a far surer Assent then what is only moral. Moral Certainty therfore necessarily help's to Faith, though Faith ultimately *Relyes* not on it. Thus, you know, the *Will* loves Good either *Real* or *Apparent*, yet need's not to love

So that
own a
Faith more
then mo-
rally cer-
tain.

Instances
how moral
certainty
help's to
Faith.

love the *cognition* which represents goodness. For that is only *conditio applicans*, a condition applying the Object to the Power, *but no Cause of Love*. I may also adhere to a Doctrine in *St. Austin* for *St. Austins* Authority, upon the Moral certain Word of one who tells, me, This great Doctor saith so. Why therefore may I not, induced by far Stronger Motives to believe this Truth. *God speaks by his Church*, Adhere only to his Revelation without touching on the Motives, which serve well as *Conditions* to Apply that Object to the Power, yet want the Strength of a formal Object to *support Faith*? But more of this Subject in another Treatise, where we shall show that the Certainty of Faith (at least *unevidens* in respect of the *material Object*) is not so much a *Speculative*, as a Prudent submissive and *Practical Certainty*.

C H A P. V I.

*Faith only morally certain, is no Faith.
Protestants have no Moral cer-
tainty of Protestant Religion.*

1. **L** Et us here suppose (contrary to Truth) that all Religion, brought to a just Trial, comes to no more but to a High Moral certainty, which, Though it implies no absolute Impossibility of being False, yet is so strong, That none, considering the great Evidence we have for Christianity, can without
madnes

64 Disc. I. C. VI, *Faith only Morally Certain*,
 madnes Practically doubt or hold it otherwise then it
 is; most Morally certain. Put the case then, That
 we arrive to this Degree of *Certainty* only, you will
 ask, why is not such a Faith stedfast enough, and
 very sufficient to Saluation? Thus far, if I mistake
 not, some *Neoteriks* make Faith certain, and strip it
 of all further infallibility. I answer. *A Faith only*
Morally certain is no Faith, and prove my Assertion.
 That wheron all Moral Certainty imaginable Essen-
 tially depend's, is fallible, and may Deceive us. That,
 wheron true Faith Essentially depends, which is Divine Reve-
 lation, is infallible and cannot Deceive: Ergo, what ever
 ground's a Moral certainty only, which may deceive, is as un-
 proportionate to uphold true Faith, as Revelation owned as
 Divine, is unfit to ground a fallible Opinion. As long ther-
 fore, as the Object of pure Moral Certainty, becomes
 not Gods Revelation, (which can never be) so long
 Faith cannot rely on it; Or, if it do rest here, it
 Mistakes its Object and call's that Revelation, which is
 none. The ultimate Reason of this Discours stands
 firm upon these two Principles. 1. All moral Certainty
 may be False. 2. Gods Revelation, Because it is Infallible as
 God; Essentially excludes that weaker Degree of Certitude, and
 cannot be false; which is to say in plainer Terms: God
 neither doth nor can speak any thing, only morally certain.

That
 wheron
 Faith re-
 lyes is in-
 fallible.
 That
 wheron
 Moral Cer-
 tainty de-
 pend's is
 fallible.

Two sure
 Principles.

2. That all Moral certainty may be false is evident.
 For invent the strongest imaginable (as This is distin-
 guished from *Physical*, or *Metaphysical* Certainty) and
 say what you will within that compas, *Viz.* Rome and
Constantinople are now Citties in Being. Or, That
 when one in a large Cittty sitt's imprisoned at noon-
 day, and hears no body; yet saith. Most surely
 all

Disc. I. C. VI. *Is not Faith.* 65

all the Inhabitants of this place are neither dead nor asleep. Such an Assertion, though most *Morally certain*, is capable of Falsity; For God may have destroyed all those men; or given them over to a strange unheard of drownsines; That's no impossibility if it were so; Why? Because the Assertion only stands upon these *Negatives*, or some like Foundations. Never yet was seen such an Effect as this, Secondary Causes never yet concurred to so Universal a Sleep or Mortality. Here is the best Assurance which can be had, and yet it may be false. Contrarywise. Suppose that God Reveal's to the Imprisoned party this Truth, duely *proposed*.

All the men of this Citty are not dead; His Belief resting on this Revelation is so Certain, that no power in Heaven can falsify it. Where you see a vast Disparity in order to *Infallibility*, between Faith and Moral certainty. The one because of its weak motive may be fals, the other strongly upheld by Revelation cannot be falsified. Perhaps you will say. At least we know not, that God speaks to us, but only upon Moral certainty.

What God Reveals is always most Certain.

Of this more presently. Here the Reply is not to the purpose; For all we convince now, is, That Faith (if any be in the World) must finally Rest on Gods infallible Revelation, and consequently, That no Motive of Moral certainty hath Strength enough to support it. Now by what means it comes at last, to be settled in this Center of Gods infallible Veracity, is another question; Thus it must Rest, or, as our Adversaries confes, *lose the Essence of infallible Faith*.

Difference between Faith and Moral Certainty.

3. Briefly. We shall now make good the other Assertion in the Title; and show, Though Moral certainty

66 Disc. I. C. VI. *Protestants have not Moral*

*Protestants
Religion
has to not
Moral Cer-
tainty.*

tainty were (as it is not) a prop strong enough to support Christian Religion, yet Protestants have no Degree of it for their Pretended Religion. I prove this Truth. By Protestantcy, we must either understand those Prudential Motives, which induce men to Believe the *Specific* and particular Doctrins of Protestants (such are *Miracles*, *Antiquity*, great *Conversions &c.*) Or rather the very Tenents and Doctrins actually believed by them. For example : *That all Pastors may err in delivering Christian Doctrin. That there are two Sacraments only*, or, what else you will. If we speak of Motives, this Religion is so naked, that it cannot shew you so much as one, as is largely Demonstrated in the 8. 9. and 10. ensuing Chapters, whether to avoyd an unnecessary Reperition, the Reader is remitted. Waving therfore at present a further Proof hereof, I Argue thus against the *Moral certainty* of their Doctrin. A Doctrin broached without Previous rational Inducements, (whose very Professors were and are no more but Fallible) and which at its first Rise, or Appearance in the World seemed a meer Paradox to the far greater part of Christians, and yet throughly examined, is held still by this far greater number (most knowing and learned) false, and improbable, cannot be a Doctrin morally certain. Protestantcy is thus confessedly fallible, and both at its Rise was, and is Still Opposed, not only by the vast number of Catholicks, But by all other Hæreticks also, as *false* and *improbable*; Ergo, it is not a *Doctrin Morally Certain*. That a Doctrin so meanly thought of and universally Decryed, cannot be thus Certain, is proved out of the very *Notion* of Moral certainty,

*Protestants
Doctrines
without
Rational
inducements.*

A Convincing Argument.

Disc. I. C. VI. *Certainty of their Religion.* 67

certainty, which though not absolutely infallible, yet, when the Grounds and Motives of it are perfectly known, it passeth for an *uncontradicted Truth*, and frees men from Doubt, *destructive* of such a degree of Certainty. Thus we say morally. *Rome and Constantinople are now Cities in being. All the inhabitants of China are not dead.* These, And the like Assertions passe for current Moral Truths, without Opposition, without Contradiction. If therefore Protestant Religion were in such a measure Morally certain; *That vast Multitude of Christians, wherof innumerable are Pious, Conscientious and Learned, could never bold it, as they do, false and improbable.* No Verity Morally certain ever mett with such a strong Contradiction. If ye say, This Opposition ariseth out of Malice, ye speak not probably, and more justly draw on your selves the like Censure, for beginning so *strange* a Religion. If you say again. These Learned Men penetrate not too well the Depth of this new Doctrin, you talk at random. Their Knowledge is not inferiour to Yours; what you se, they se, and perhaps more. Charge not therefore Ignorance on them, wherof your selves are more likely guilty.

The reason of the Argument.

A Verity Morally Certain was never so long and universally opposed as Protestantism is.

4. Yet some Replies may be here expected. One is. Protestants have moral Assurance of their Bible, Because all say it is Gods Word; Ergo they have Assurance of their Religion also. The Antecedent is bad, and the Consequence worse. *Arians, Pelagians, and all Hæreticks are as morally assured of their Bible, as any Protestant.* Have they, I pray you, as great Certainty of those pestilent Hæresies proved, as they think, out of the Bible? You say no, Because they

Moral Assurance of the Bible is no Assurance of True Religion.

68 Disc.I.C.VI. *Protestants have not Moral*

Interpret amis, and you do not. Learnedly answered. But who makes your Interpretation better then Theirs? They have that Book, and spend their private Judgement on it; you have no more. Unles therefore your *Book* or Judgement be better then Theirs, You are Altogether as uncertain of your particular Doctrins, as They of Theirs. The Reason is: Because you have not one Sole Expres Text of Scripture for Protestancy. You may add your own Glosses, and make it speak Protestancy; But these Glosses are no more *Scripture*, nor more morally certain, then Those of *Arians*, *Pelagians* &c. Therefore a moral Assurance of the Bible which is easily abused, gives no man moral certainty of sound Doctrin. But of this subject hereafter.

*Protestant
Glosses no
more Scri-
pture then
the Glosses
of Arians.*

5. A second Objection. As what is Fals, may be by errour judged Morally certain, so often what is True, may not be held *Morally* certain. Therefore though Protestancy want's that High Moral certainty now required, yet it may be True. I answer. But if it want Moral certainty, it *bath it not*, which is all we prove at present. Again. Though it may be true (which is impossible) so also it may be fals. Now Protestants, I hope, do not believe a meer Possibility only, nor the *May be* of Truth (for many Things are not which may be) but they Believe more, the *Actual* supposed Truth of Protestancy. And this they cannot do without Moral Certainty of that which they hold *Actually* true.

*Sectaries
can not be-
lieve the
actual
Truth of
Protestan-
cy.*

6. A third Objection, and, 'Tis more to the purpose. Our Argument now proposed proves too much, and Therefore proves nothing, For its best For-
ce

Disc. I. C. VI. *Certainty of their Religion.* 69

ce lyes in this one Assertion, *viz.* *That a Doctrin or Religion, which is Opposed by the greatest part of Christians, as False and Paradoxal, cannot be Morally certain.* If this Principle hold good, it if followes, That much, and very much too, of the Roman Catholick Doctrin, want's also moral Certainty, Because a very great number of Christians oppugne it as fals. Some deny the *Popes Supremacy*, Others the *Real Presence*, Others *Purgatory*, Others *Praying for the Dead &c.* And Protestants, after their long study, deny all These at once; Therefore such Doctrins cannot be Morally certain.

7. I answer first. This Objection, without doubt, Proves too much and impugn's a Certain Truth of Christianity. For tell me, when the whole world, as *St. Hierom* saith, growning under Arianism, saw that Hæresy far and neer diffused: Did that Opposition weaken the Moral certainty which Orthodox Christians had then of a Trinity of Persons in one Essence? (And we only speak now of Moral Evidence Antecedent to Faith.) If so, the Motives morally evident for the Belief of that Mystery ceased; or, at least lost their *Ancient Vigor*, which is fals. And one great Reason is; Because that true Doctrin of a Trinity had no *first Rise*, nor appeared like a new Paradox in the world as *Protestancy* did, peeping out like an unknown Stranger, when *Luther* and *Calvin* first broach'd it. No, That Catholick Doctrin was universally believed by all faithful Christians, before *Arians* were born. The Motives therfore, which made it evidently Credible before *Arius*, continued firm (notwithstanding His Opposition) and still induced Christians to Believe as They had done formerly. Which Reason

*Ancient
Motives
never lose
their Force.*

*Catholick
Doctrin
had no first
Rise like
Protestan.*

70 Disc. I. C. VII. *Of Sectaries error, of their*
 also holds good to our present purpose, And doth not
 only give an immense Disparity between the Moral
 evident Certainty of Catholick Religion, And what
 ever Certainty Hæresy can Pretend to; But also, De-
 monstratively makes both Protestantcy and all Hære-
 sy improbable. And this Truth I shall evidence, ha-
 ving first cleared the Fallacy which intricates the Re-
 ply now in hand.

C H A P. VII.

*How Sectaries err in the search made af-
 ter Religion. Of their weak and Im-
 probable Opposition. The Obje-
 ction is more fully answered.*

1. OVR Sectaries and all Hæreticks err grossly in a
 main Principle, which breed's nothing but
 Confusion to themselves, and Others. Thus it is.
 In their search after True Religion They run on, But
 how? *Extra viam*, in a wrong and mistaken way.
 Some will find it out by the Book of Holy Scripture,
 which few *exactly* read, and none can understand by
 his private judgement, These err, *not knowing Scrip-
 ture*, And may, as *St. Austin* notes *Epist. 40. ad Deo gra-
 tias*, end their Lives, before they end Difficulties this
 way. Others fly to the Doctrin of the Primitive
 Church, and looke Themselves. For, what private
 man can now by his meer reading, Morally ascertain
 me,

*Hæreticks
 errour in
 their search
 of True Re-
 ligion.
 Some for
 Scripture
 only.*

*Others fly
 to the pri-
 mitive
 Church
 Doctrin.*

Disc. I. C. V II. *Improbable Opposing Catholics.* 71

me, or any, of the indubitable universal Sense of that Doctrin? Whereas all, which the Church held then, was not writ: Of what was writ, part is lost, and much of what remains, is (as experience Teacheth) lyable to Cavils and Misinterpretations. Others (and it is a *Socinian* jogg) Decide all by weak Humane Reason, as, if forsooth, Wit alone were able to Fathom Gods *Incomprehensible Secrets*. Others finally without further Inspection, stand poering on the material Objects or Mysteries of Faith, and after many a mispent Houre, ask at last of a very unskilful Master (their own *weak Reason*) what it Judgeth of these Mysteries? If Reason, as it often fall's out, find's them difficil, It Cast's them away, as meer *Improbabilisities*. Thus the *Arian* reject's a *Trinity*, The *Pelagian* *Original Sin*, The Protestant *Christs Real Presence* in the Eucharist, Because they run into Dark matters, whick only puzzle Reason, and wave those further Considerations, which clear all, *And make Faith, if not evidently certain in Attestante, at least evidently credible.*

Others are for Reason only.

Others stay on the difficil Mysteries of Faith.

All labour lost.

2. I say therfore. The most easy way to find out true Religion, or the first unquestionable Evidence which points it out, lyes open, and is obvious to All, Before we either examin particular Mysteries of Faith, or enter upon Proofs, Drawn from Scripture, Councils, or Fathers. It is true, from these Grounds, we have irrefragable Arguments against all Sectaries; But can They think, that the wise Providence of God hath put, as it were, Religion so far out of sight, or set it at so great a Distance from us, That none can come to the knowledge of it, Before Scripture, Fathers, and those large Volumes of Councils are exactly examined,

The way to find out True Religion is easy and evident.

72 Disc. I. C. VII. *Of Sectaries Error, of their*
 mined, whic few read, and fewer understand? No
 certainly. True Religion evidenceth it self, and is

True Reli-
 gion evi-
 denceth it
 self.

most Discernable from error by an other clear and
 conspicuous Light, which none can but se (unles
 he wilfully shut his eyes) *Antecedently to the Perusal of*
Scripture, Fathers &c. This Light or Evidence we
 may rightly call Gods own *perswasive Language*, wher-
 by he Speaks to Reason before we Elicit Faith, and
 rationally convinceth all of this general Truth. *One So-*
cietie of Christians There is, wherein my Eternal Truths are
Taught, this I make manifest by evident Signes, by the Lights
of clear and undeniable Motives, wherof none can, but most
unreasonably, doubt. So it is, saith Origen Hom. 30. in
Matth. Ecclesia plena est fulgore ab Oriente usque ad Occiden-
tem. The Church, like a Resplendent Sun, casteth out Lu-
 stre from East to West; and They are blind, who see not
 so clear a Brightnes. Thus much premised.

Sectaries
 grounables
 impugning
 Catholick
 Doctrin.

3. I Answer to the Objection above, and say.
 Though thousands more then Sectaries impugn part of the Ro-
 man Catholick Doctrin, yet as long as God demonstratively Evi-
 denceth the absolute Credibility of that Church which teaches it,
 By such rational prudent, and pressing Motives, as have gai-
 ned Millions of Soules to Believe, our Adversaries in banding
 against Church Doctrin, only bewray Malice, Ignorance, or
 Both, And do no more but cast dirt at a Sun, which provi-
 dence (maugre Their weak Attempts) will have to Shine,
 whilst Christianity lasteth. So Urgent therefore, so Illu-
 strious are these Motives (as I shal presently declare)
 for the total Belief of what the Roman Catholick
 Church teaches, That they do not only suppress and silence
 such weak Opponents, But also make Protestancy, and all other
 Sects improbable, and incredible. The reason hereof (most
 am-

Disc. I. C. VII. *Improbable Opposing Catholics.* 73

amply laid forth in the three next following Chapters) stand's sure on these two undeniable Principles.

First; That Church which *Christ Iesus* founded, (and his Blessed Intention was to gain the whole World to it) is so *Eminently Glorious*, so *Clearly Marked* with un-
boubted Signs and most *Legible Characters* of Truth, That the Simplest Man, if he follow Reason, may find it out, and Believe securely. No other but the

*Christ mani-
fested to
All, and so
is his
Church.*

Roman Catholick Church *only* is thus Evidenced. Se

*The Roman
Catholick
Church
only, Evi-
denced
Credibly*

Chap. 8. 9. 10. The second Principle. This Holy Church, which Age after Age (without any late rise, like that of Protestancy) hath stood constantly ever since *Christ*, and drawn whole Kingdoms and Nations to its Belief; was either on set Purpose raised up by Almighty God, and conserved in Being, for so long a time, to Cheat the world into a false Belief (which is Impious to think) or must be owned, as it deserves, for the only *undoubted* most *manifested*, and *gloriously evidenced Church of Christ*. Se Chap. 8. n. 5. 6.

*It was not
founded by
Christ to
cheat the
world.*

4. You will say. Notwithstanding all the glorious Marks we can lay claim to, and grace our Church withal, very many Learned Men do oppose it. If then the Argument above have force This very Opposition of so many, *Weaken's* much, and takes of no few Degrees of that Moral certainty we stand for. *Contra.*

Very many Learned men opposed both Apostolical and Primitive Doctrin, Atheists band against God, and Jewes against *Christ*, the Arians yet impugn a Trinity. Are our Sectaries affrighted upon that Account, or weakned in their Moral Certainty of thar Mystery, whilst They Believe it? No: Every Trivial and slight Opposition therefore, made against a Verity

*Slight Op-
position not
Valued of.*

K

which

74 Disc. I. C. V II. Of *Secularies* Error, of their

which strongly *Defend's* and powerfully plead's for it self, can neither dant, nor discountenance it. The

It ought to be deeply rational and brought to certain Principles.

Opposition then in our present Matter (if to the purpose) ought to be well Grounded and deeply *Rational*; grounded, I say, not upon what, This or That private person by his sole fallible bosom Thoughts, holds Reasonable (for so every Arian will make good his *Hæresy*) But the Opposition if *rational* must go further, and rest at last upon a Solid and *satisfactory Principle*,

Secularies destitute of any Rational Proof against the Catholick Church.

which well laid forth, gently forceth every Prudent and Disinterested Man to Acquiesce and yeild to it. But this cannot be done in our present case; for *Secularies* are so utterly destitute of what ever look's like a Rational Proof or any received Principle, They are so disinabled to speak *with sense* against the known Evidence of the Roman Catholick Religion, That (And I do assert it boldly) *They shall as soon turn Christianity out of the World, as rationally abate or lessen the plain and undisputable Evidence of this one Christian Society.*

Solid Principles for the Catholick Church.

5. This *blessed Society* therefore, stands thus upon firm Ground, upon solid and undoubted Principles. I shew you, *saith this Church*, Those very Motives, which anciently countenanced the Preaching of *Christ*, and converted the world, And These plead for me. With what urgent contrary Proofs can you, my good Protestants, deface such Glorious Marks of Truth, or make them either Insignificant, or forceles Arguments? Is this weightily done by drawing a few trivial Glosses out of mistaken Scripture? By telling us of Council contradicting Council, By quoting our Authors wrongfully, By relating a story not worth the hearing of a *Pope*, or *Prelate*? Are these Manly proofs, think ye,

Secularies trifles.

or.

Disc. I. C. V I I. *Improbable Opposing Catholicks.* 73

or sufficient to Eclipse the Glory of the Ancient Church? *Toyes, Trifles, Frivolous.* I shew you again, *Other Evidences of the Catholick Church.* *The most Wise and Learned of the world, notwithstanding the Opposition made against this Church, lived and dyed in it.* That the most Wise of the World, the most Learned, the most Holy (Their Number is numberles) notwithstanding the Opposition made against me, have Age after Age (even before and after your Hæresy began) Constantly professed my Faith, lived and dyed in it without Change and Alteration: Tel me, were These Millions of Souls, learned and unlearned for a thousand years and more, *All mad, All besotted, all seduced by Fooleries?* It is worse then Madnes to say so. Here then is a principle, *in moral matters,* the Surest imaginable, for our Church. This *Nubes testium* alone, and of *such witnesses* (which is ever to be reflected on) makes it *evidently Credible.* And by what contrary *rational Proof or received Principle,* can our Adversaries enervate, or make null the Testimony of these innumerable *Givers in of Evidence,* who led on by Motives, which They thought Rational (and what passed for Reason amongst so many and such *qualified Persons,* ought to passe for Reason with all). Believed this Church and dyed in it happily? I'll tell you, had our Sectaries *Salomons Wisdom,* They would yet be unable to satisfy This one Argument probably, much less to Evidence it forceles, upon either solid Proof or, any received Principle. The reason is. No proof can vainquish an evident Verity; But it is an evident *Verity,* that God Cheated not the World by means of so numerous a multitude of *Catholick Professors.* It is an evident Verity, That all those Wise and Learned Catholicks were neither Mad, nor, for so long a time, Deluded by Fooleries.

Other Evidences of the Catholick Church.

The most Wise and Learned of the world, notwithstanding the Opposition made against this Church, lived and dyed in it.

All These Wise and Learned cannot be supposed mad, or seduced by Fooleries.

Protestants cannot Answer This one Argument.

No proof against Evident Truth.

76 Disc. I. C. VII. Of *Sectaries* Error, of their

*If Sectaries
slight such
witnesses,
They slight
themselves
much
more.*

He therefore, who, when rational Proofs fail, cannot speak a reasonable word against these Millions of witnesses, But slights and undervalues them; doth not only slight the greatest Authority on Earth, But also, if he be a Protestant, must slight Protestantism; if an Arian, Arianism. For these *Sects* have neither Authority, nor Witnesses comparable to those of the Catholick Church.

*Sectaries
never come
to Principles.*

6. For conclusion of this matter, be pleased to note, That as our Adversaries are destitute of rational Proofs (reducible to *received Principles*) whilst They impugn the clear Evidence of our Church, so they also want them in all other particular Controversies. For, whether They go about to oppose our Doctrine, or to prove their own, You can never draw from them Proof brought to an *undoubted Principle*, as I shall most amply show hereafter. They are Opponents ('Tis true) when they tell us we have changed the Ancient Doctrine of the Church, brought in novelties, and I know not what. We hear such Talk, but where is the *Propositio quiescens*, or grounded Proof to make this Charge good? They say so, And that is all. And yet, if possible, They are worse at it, in proving Their own Doctrine. Take here one Instance, you shall have more hereafter. We demand upon what rational Proof can These men Believe the Sacred Mystery of the *Blessed Trinity*, and deny the Catholick Doctrine of *Christ's Real Presence* in the Sacrament? Are they forced to Admit of the one, and Reject the other by clear and manifest Scripture? Evidently no. Scripture is without controversy, more openly Significant, and Expressive for the Real Presence, then for a *Trinity*. Doth the Difficulty of

*A question
proposed.*

*Protestants
believe one
Mystery,
reject another
with
out proof.*

of

Disc. I. C. V II. *Improbable Opposing Catholics:* 77

of the Sacrament rationally retard their Belief? The *Trinity* is yet a more difficult Mystery to Reason. O, but the *Trinity* was ever Believed by the True Church: So, say I, was The other Mystery also. But speak Reason now, And say, what Church was it which ever believed the *Trinity*? The Roman Catholick Church surely, For *Arius* and others impugned that Mystery. Now Protestants say this Roman Catholick Church erred in believing *Christ's Real Presence*; and if so, They are most unreasonable in relying on it for the Belief of a *Trinity*; For, if it erred in the Belief of one Mystery, it may as well have erred in the other. They may say, the best and most Ancient Fathers held a *Trinity*. Very true; And as evidently They believed *Christ's Real Presence* in the Eucharist. But what will you say, if I infringe the Authority of these learned Father in this matter? I can do it (though not in Real Truth) most easily, being assisted by the Principles of Protestants, who tell us, that the whole Roman Church, That is, All the Fathers and Doctors of it, erred for a thousand years together in believing the Catholick Doctrin of the Blessed Sacrament. Whereupon I inferre Those Ancient Fathers, who both learnedly defended, and piously believed a *Mysterious Trinity*, may more likely have erred in doing so, then, that a whole Church, for so vast a Time, hath patronised erroneous Doctrin, and falsely believed the Real Presence. Most undoubredly, *The wisdom and Authority of this long standing Catholick Church, is, in true Prudence, of greater sway and value, then the sole Authority of those far fewer Ancient Fathers can be* (though most

If this Church had erred, the Fathers may more likely have erred.

*Sectaries
who slight
a whole
learned
Church
may more
rationally
slight the
Ancient
Fathers.*

Venerable, and worthy all Respect) that writ of the *Sacred Trinity*. Those men therefore, who have the Boldnes to slight so great a Church, cannot with so much as a colour of Reason Reverence more highly those Ancient Fathers. But enough of this Subject. Let us now go on to a further consideration of these prudent Motives, and se more particularly, what Religion gives us the best Evidence of Them.

C H A P. VIII.

A few Reflections made upon these Motives of credibility. No Religion hath Motives founding moral certainty but One only, which is the Roman Catholick Religion.

All Christians profess not Christ's true Doctrine.

How God leads us to the knowledge of true Religion.

I. **N**Ote first. If God (as we now suppose) guides us by his Providence, and hath established true Religion in the world, it is as certain, that all who profess Christianity (for example *Arians*, and *Pelagians*) believe not intierly *Christ's* true Doctrine, as that some, blessed by so singular a Favour, both rightly believe, and profess it. It is again most certain, That if this wise Providence draws us not to the knowledge of true Religion by *Euchusias*, *private Illustration*, or the *ministry of Angels*; it leads us on by extrinsecal Motives,

ves, suitable to Reason, by rational Inducements, or discernable Evidence: And, these we call known Signs, Cognisances of Truth, evident Marks, clear Characters, or plain speaking Language, which plead as it were in Gods behalf, and as clearly shew us where true Religion is, as These visible Creatures manifest a Deity, or, as that Star which brought the Sages to Bethlem, pointed out the Saviour of the world. None can Deny These plain Inducements of Faith; But such as deny those first and most clear Manifestations of Truth, which Christ our Lord and his Blest Apostles evidenced, when by Their admirable Miracles, strange Conversions, Sanctity of life &c. They withdrew beguiled Soules from Error, and wrought Faith in Them, Before one Word of Scripture was registred.

2. Note 2. (And it is the Reflection of a learned Author.) As no man enters on a Dispute with others, but he hopes to get the better; so God, when he proposeth true Religion to Christians, engageth as it were in a Dispute with the Devil, and all those Sectaries who oppose it, And therefore cannot hope, But is sure to conquer and convince his Adversaries; otherwise it were folly to begin a Dispute; which would not end to his Honor. Now, if he convince, he doth it, by the Force and Efficacy of such powerful Arguments, laid out to Reason, as are able to silence all Opponents: For, strong rational Inducements perswasively work on Reason, And clear mans Intellectual power from all Mistrust and Doubt.

God, as it were, Disputes against Falshood with rational Arguments.

And silences all Opponents of Truth.

3. Note 3. It is impossible (after the Establishment of true Faith amongst Christians) That God, either will or can permit a false Religion to be more Speciously evident to Reason by Force of rational Motives, then his true Religion:

80 Disc.I.CVIII. No Religion hath Motives

A false Religion cannot be more Speciously evident to reason, than Gods true Religion is, For were this possible, He would oblige Reason by rational Inducements to embrace a false Religion, which is highly repugnant to his Goodness. And, upon this ground I say more. It is impossible, *That a false Religion equalize the true One, in the Evidence of rational Motives; For, if the evidences for Falshood be equal with those other of Truth, God would stand guilty of arguing less efficaciously, in behalf of his own Verities.* We must then conclude, That Gods true Religion, ever, most eminently surpasseth falshood in the grace and lustre of those Motives which evidence it to Reason. And from hence it followes, *That no man can in Justice appropriate those rational Inducements, which draw reason to find out true Religion, to all, who go under the name of Christians; For amongst these (whether Arians or others) you have false Religions; but the Marks, Motives and Cognisances of Truth cannot belong to a false Religion, unless God propose error as Speciously evident to Reason, as his own Revealed Truth, which is now proved impossible.*

Rational Motives belong not to all called Christians.

Two Religions in Competition. 4. These few Reflections premised. Let us look about us, and cast a serious Thought on two Religions only, which as it seem's, stand justling with one another, yea, and will needs come into Competition for Truth. The one is, the Ancient and long Continued Roman Catholick Religion. The other, is that late Novelty of Protestantism. Let reason, I say, go here impartially to work, let it make a diligent enquiry after the Rational Motives, which, as it were, plead in behalf of these two different Religions. Both are not true, and Therefore both cannot be evidenced by the like Marks and Cognisances of Truth, the One must yeild

Both cannot be True both have not the like Evidence.

Disc. I.C.VIII. *Certainty, but the Roman Catholick.* 81
 yeild to the Other. What do I say yeild? The
 first appears like a glorious Sun *Procedens & crescens usque
 ad perfectum diem*, which, as *Origen* saith, casteth such
 lustre from East to West, that all eyes Behold it.
 The other of Protestancy, *Reason finds so nakedly Poor, so
 destitute of Light, and Motives, That its mean Appearance
 makes it despicable*, and not worth the looking at.

5. Briefly then I Argue for the moral Evidence of our
 Catholick Roman Religion. A Religion, which, af-
 ter the just Condemnation of so many undoubted and
 acknowledged Hæreticks, hath *permanently stood Visibly
 victorious for 16. hundred years*, And which never yet was
 condemned by any known true Church of Error or Hæresy.
A Religion, which hath drawn thousands of Infidels, and A-
liens (from Christ) to its Belief. And which hath had Age
after Age, whole millions of constant Professors, wherof in-
numerable were not only most Wise, Learned and Vertuous, But
willingly also lost their temporal Fortunes, and courageously shed
their Blood for it. Such a Religion, I say, which hath
 thus perswasively wrought on the Reason of so many
 Wise, and Learned &c. And, gained to it whole mul-
 titudes of *Believers*, and *Martyrs*, shewes by this one
admirable Effect (had we no other Proof) Strength and
 Evidence enough to convince the most obdurate Hart in
 the World. For, either (as I noted above) we must
 say, That all these Wise and Glorious Men were mad,
 as being induced by Fooleries to Believe, and dye as
 they did; or grant, That They had clear and undenia-
 ble Evidence to warrant their Belief, for which we now
 plead. Nay, I say more: So general a Mistake and De-
 lusion, is upon an other Account most impossible; For,
 that great Care and Providence which God had ever of his Church,

*Moral Evi-
 dence for
 the Roman
 Catholick
 Religion.*

*It hath
 gained in-
 numerable
 Believers.*

*Gods Pro-
 vidence
 over his
 Church*

L

could

81 Disc.I.C.VIII No Religion hath Motives

could not
permit so
general a
Delusion.

Note well, a
vast im-
possibility.

No Religion
Ex termi-
nis Evi-
dently true
or false.

Convin-
cing Argu-
ments for
Catholick
Religion.

could not permit (if true Faith were in the world from the fifth Age to *Luther*) so learned , so numerous , and pretious a part of Christians as Roman Catholicks were in those Days, to be led into a false Belief by either trivial or foolish Motives. If we swallow down this vast impossibility, we must Conclude, that, for so long a time, God had no true Church at all; For none, called. Christians, were then in being But Catholicks only, and known condemned Hereticks. But of this particular most largely Hereafter. In the interim

6. I propose a second and most convincing Argument. No Religion, whether it be that of *Iesus Christ*, or *Mahomet*, that of Catholicks, or Sectaries, either is, or can be *ex Terminis evidently True or False*; neither can a bare Affirmation for its Truth, without farther Proof, force Reason to accept of it: Otherwise, every man might now begin a new Religion as he list's, and sufficiently warrant it by only saying; He speaks Truth. True Religion therefore must have its Evidence, and known Discernibility from Error, before it be accepted of. And now, because both Catholicks and all Sectaries suppose, that the Religion, which *Christ Iesus* and his Blessed Apostles taught, was indubitably and clearly evidenced by Marks, and convincing Signs of Truth. We are in the first place to ponder well those Motives, which made evident that first Christian and Apostolical Doctrin; and next to Consider, whether the very like Motives have not evidenced the Roman Catholick Faith Age after Age. Briefly. The greatest and most visible Evidences for that Apostolical Doctrin, were (to omit others) first, most known and unquestioned Miracles. (The Dead rose up to Life, the Blind saw, the Deaf heard,

Disc. I. C. V III. But the Roman Catholick. 83

heard, Devils were ejected out of possessed Persons &c.)

2. Admirable Conversions wrought upon Infidels and Gentils.

3. An exemplar Neglect of the World, conjoynd with great Sanctity of life &c. But these Evidences are clear,

*Apostolical
Evidences
of Mira-
cles, Con-
versions
&c. are
the Chur-
ches Evi-
dence.*

without dispute for the Doctrin of the Roman Catholick Church, and for no other Religion. Therefore if

those primitive Miracles, that Efficacy of Doctrin, those great Conversions, that admirable Sanctity of the first Aposto-

lical Men, perswasively induced Aliens from Truth, to believe in Christ, They are yet, as powerful and forceable to induce All, who follow Reason, to Believe

both the Antecedent Church of Rome; and this modern Church also, now in Being. No tolerable Reply can be given

to this Argument. Will our new Men deny eminent Sanctity to innumerable, who profess our Roman Religion?

*Evidence of
Sanctity.*

The contrary is evident, by all those apparent Signs, wherby Sanctity can be known in this mortal Life.

Witness the Contempt of the World manifest in Thousands, the charitable Alms deeds of Seculars, the Austere

and mortified Life of Religious, wherof more Hereafter &c. O, but all Pastors and Doctors of the Catholick Church

are not Saints like the Apostles. Frivolous. No more were all the Primitive Pastors or People for 4.

or 5. Ages after Christ so Eminently Holy, (do our Protestants arrive to that Degree of Sanctity?) Yet thou-

sands then were, and are still without debate, Innocent, Holy and Virtuous.

7. Again, Can Sectaries deny those prodigious Conversions of Nations, wrought by this Church upon

Heathens and Aliens from Christ? If they do, All are upon Record, both Friends and Enemies attribute

these Wonders to that Mother Church. Tell me, I beseech

*Evidence
of Conver-
sions.*

beseech you, who converted our once most Catholick England to the Faith it Anciently had, but Roman Catholicks? Who reduced Germany, Polony, Spain, France, Denmark, Swedland, and the Low-Countries to the same Faith? *They were Men united in Belief with the Roman Church.* Who yet send Missioners to those remoter Parts of the world, to China, Iapony and other Places? This Church only doth God that Service, while our Ministers sit at home with ease, tyed fast to their fine Wives, and fat Benefices. If Finally they doubt of our Miracles, They may as well doubt of the Suns light at noon Day, so Conspicuous They have been ever in this Church, and are still to this present Age. Wherof more in the next Chapter. All I ask now is, Whether it be not morally certain, that the World had once in it such Men as were called *Alexander, Caesar, Pompey, Cicero?* yes. As great Evidence we have for most eminent Miracles done by this Church: *Constant Tradition, known Records, undoubted History, convey them to us;* All which none can Deny, without wilful Perversnes, And a High degree of Impudency. Yet suppose Men so impertinently bold, as to question some Miracles; whether for example, ever since the primitive Age any were raised from death to life? Whether Devils have been Cast out? Whether Sight were restored to the Blind, Strength to the Lame (All these are upon Record?) *Yet they cannot deny that grand and convincing Miracle of Conversions, which is Proof enough, as St. Austin Learnedly Consider's lib. 22. Civitat. Cap. 5. Chiefly at those words.*

*Evidence of
Miracles
done by the
Catholick
Church.*

*Conversion
of Nations
a great
Miracle.*

*St. Austins
Discourse.*

Si rem credibilem crediderunt. If men, saith he, Belieyed a thing credible (he speaks of the Resurrection of the dead

dead, and the like is of any other Mystery in Faith) *videant quàm sint stolidi*, se what fools Those are, who will not believe. *Si autem res incredibilis est.* If the thing be incredible. This is most incredible, yea, and the *strangest miracle of all*, that, That *which was deem'd Incredible*, gained Belief the whole World over. The Argument is convincing, and proves as well, that those after Conversions wrought upon Infidels by Roman Evangelical Preachers, were Admirable, and truly *Miraculous*. Millions have been converted by them. These numerous multitudes therefore of Believers were either drawn on by fooleries. If so; They were mad, And here lyes the *Miracles*, saith *St. Austin*, *Viz. That Fooleries could induce so many to Contemn the World, and become good Christians: Or, Contrarywise, They believed this Roman Catholick Church upon weighty Moral Motives.* If so; *why are not our Protestants obliged to believe as they did, upon the same prudent Inducements.* If They Tell us: The Church Taught an other Doctrin, when these great Conversions were made, then it Teaches now; They do not only most unlearnedly Suppose what is to be Proved (yea cannot be proved because utterly false) But also speak not one Word to the Purpose; For, both our Progenitors in England and innumerable others, were drawn from Error by Popish Preachers. And even in this present Age, the like glorious Conversions are, and have been wrought by these Blessed mens Labours, and *Theirs only*. Now if you ask upon what Account such Conversions are to be esteemed *Miraculous*? This one Instance answers you. Imagine you saw a little Flock of Sheep or Lambs, sent into a

Fooleries could not induce Millions to contemn the world and become good Christians.

Why these Conversions are so to be esteemed Miraculous.

86 Disc.I. C.VIII. No Religion hath Motives

Desert, full of ravenous Wolves, withall; That these Lambs, though at first many were devoured, yet at length render'd the Wolves so Tame, and so abated their Rage, that they became like Lambs, mild and submissive. Would you not say, that such a work were prodigious, and above the force of nature? This is our very case.

Behold saith our Saviour, *Luc. 10. I send you as Lambs amongst Wolves*, And these you must subdue. It was done. Behold, saith the Roman Catholick Church, I send my Preachers still abroad to the Remotest parts of the World, and have changed Wolves into Lambs, That is, I have made Infidels, once Rebellious to *Christ*, Subject to his lawes, the Vitious I have made Virtuous, and brought thousands of them to no other Religion, but Popery. This work, with the Assistance of Gods Grace is done, *Et est mirabile in oculis nostris*, and 'tis admirable.

Had our Protestants made such Changes, or drawn so many Infidels to their new Faith, they would have talked of wonders; But because Catholicks gained them to the old Religion, all is Nothing. So it is. *They have no Miracles, and therefore Slight them: No Conversions, and therefore undervalue them.* A Strange proceeding. Those very wonders which induced the world to become Christian, Because they yet eminently appear in the Roman Catholick Church, must ly under Contempt; Those Ancient Proofs of Christianity are now proofles, Those Primitive Evidences of *Miracles, conversions &c.* (the Church is in fault for shewing them) cannot be seen by these later Men, who yet have Eyes to discern the Book of Scripture by its own Light and Majesty. And by the way mark the

Para-

Why Protestants
Slight Mi-
racles, and
Conver-
sions?

Disc. I. C. VIII. but the Roman Catholick. 87

Paradox. The exterior words of a Bible (for of these we only speak) are Evidences enough for Scripture; yet those glorious works now mentioned are (forsooth) no Evidence of this Church. *The very Majesty of the Style* Ascertain's these men, that God Speaks by that Sacred Book; yet all the *perceptible miraculous Majesty*, which the Church shewes us, cannot perswade them, that he speaks by this *visible, audible, and most known Oracle of Truth*. A Bible (well known, its true, upon other Grounds to be most Sacred) discovers its Divinity, and immediatly proves who writ it, *Yet a Church so gloriously marked, says nothing who Directs it*. Is this Reason, or Religion think ye? Can Reason produce this unreasonable Thought in any, That the wise Providence of God hath permitted so eminent, so numerous, so pious, so learned, and so long standing a Multitude of Christians, as Catholicks have been (and yet are) to be Cheated into Errour, even whilst they evidence their Faith, by such Proofs and Motives, as *Christ and his Apostles manifested Christian Religion*? What? Shall we think that *Miracles, Conversions of Souls, casting out of Devils, Sanctity of life &c.* which were once convincing Arguments of Christianity; are now showed to countenance a Falsity? To judge so, is the most improbable Thought that ever entered a Christians Heart, yea, and impossible, unless we hold, that God can leave of to be *Goodnes it self*, or, make Falshood more apparently evident then Truth the whole World over: which is proved to be a gross errour.

A Paradox of Sentences.

So far as judge im- probably.

8. Other Arguments we have for a greater Certainty then moral, *previously* Evidencing the Roman Catholick

88 Disc. I. C. VIII. No Religion hath Motives

Protestants
grant Evi-
dence of
Credibility
to the Ro-
man Ca-
tholick Re-
ligion.

Motives
Evidencing
true Reli-
gion inse-
parably fol-
low that.

tholick Religion before we Believe ; whereof more in the next Chapter. It is now sufficient to say, That our Protestants grant thus much. First, because the more learned of them allow Salvation to those, who live and dye in this Faith; But most sure it is, That Saving Faith hath at least moral Evidence, and Certainty for it. 2. Whilst They talk of no man knowes what Evidence manifesting Christian Religion in General, They only plead for our Catholick Faith, and speak not a word in behalf of Protestancy. The Reason is. If both these Religions are not True, but the One only, *The Motives which Evidence true Religion inseparably follow That, and cannot belong* (as I have already proved) *to the Other, which is false.* Therefore They, or We, are obliged to show them. But Protestancy cannot show so much as one prudent Motive for it self, as will most clearly appear in the 10. Chapter: *Ergo*, what Evidence there is for true Christian Faith, Catholicks have it, or there is none in the World for any Religion.

C H A P. IX.

A short Digression concerning the Shuffling of Protestants in this matter.

Mr. Still-
ing fleets
weak en-
deavours.

1. **H**ERE I cannot but reflect on the slight endeavours of some later Sectaries, who offer at Much in an Empty Title called *The Protestants way of resolving Faith*; yet in prosecuting the matter, They handle

Disc. I. C. IX. *Of Protestants shuffling in this matter.* 89
handle it so unluckily, that no man Hear's a word more spoken in behalf of Protestantism, then of Arianism, or of what ever other Hæresy. Motives and Reasons they give none for Protestant Doctrine, as *Protestancy*, As They ought to have done in the first place, after so glorious a Title.

2. To prove what is said, have patience to hear some few parergons. *There are*, say They, *in the question of resolving Faith these three questions to be resolved.* First, *Why I believe those things to be true, which are contained in the Book called Scripture?* 2. *Why I believe the Doctrine contained in that Book to be Divine?* 3. *Why I believe the Books themselves to be of Divine Revelation?*

Mark here a Shuffling, and remember once more the Title. *The Protestants way of resolving Faith.* Is it so? Is it the Protestants way? Yes. Surely then the Questions here proposed, and the Answers returned are most Pertinent to help on Protestants in their resolving Faith, That is, to make Protestancy

evidently credible by clear and rational Motives. You will say, They are so. And I say, They are no more to that purpose (of Protestants resolving Faith,

or giving of prudent Motives for Protestancy) then if such a Religion had never been in the world. I prove my Assertion. The Arian will say. *I believe those Things to be True which are contained in Scripture.*

I believe the Doctrine in that Book, to be Divine. *I believe the Books themselves to be of Divine Revelation,* and this I do upon as good Grounds, as you Protestants, if not on better.

For if you admit of these Verities, upon the greatest Evidence, which things of that Nature are capable of, So do I too. But say, I beseech

M

you

These Antitheses wave what they should Explicate.

Arians believe Scripture no more than Protestants

you, what more Advantage have you upon this Con-
 cession, for your *particular Religion*, then I have for mi-
 ne? For, let these Books be *True*, let them contain
Divine Doctrin, let us believe the Revelation in them
 to be Sacred, yet both you and I are to seek which
 of us hath the better Religion, and this cannot be de-
 cided by *owing three Truths*, wherof no Christian
 ever doubted. Why therefore do you, when it is
 your particular Task to resolve *Protestants Faith*, never
 meddle with the Question? But wast time in pro-
 ving that, which when it is proved, help's you no
 more then all other Christians, who are contrary to
 you in Belief. Will you se this clearly?

3. I freely grant, that those things in Scripture
 are True, They are Divine, the Books themselves
 are of *Divine Revelation*. But next ask, What is this to
 Protestant Religion? Or, how, is the Resolution of
 Protestants Faith advanced upon the owning *These Ve-*
rities? Nothing at all. And the Reason is, for
 though all Christians acknowledge in general Scriptu-
 re to be most Divine, yet they are at endles Disputes
 concerning the Doctrin of it. Now, no Man, I hope,
 will say, Because he hath this Book in his hands, or owns it
 as Gods Word, that therefore He rightly Believes the particular
 necessary Doctrin in it. For, were this true, known
 Hæretiks would be as sound in Faith as any. To
 conclude then, The Roman Catholick enquires not
 here after any general Proof of Scripture (He proved that
 before Protestants were born). But he urges for Ma-
 jor, and rational Indutemants, wherby Protestancy, as
 Protestancy, is evidenced to have any resemblance with
 the Primitive Doctrin of *Christ* and his blessed Apostles.

Known

To have
 Scripture in
 our hands
 gives no
 Assurance
 of true
 Faith.

What Ca-
 tholicks re-
 quire of
 Protestants.

Known Marks and Cognitances of Truth, must manifest this particular *Doctrin*, And not a general talk of the *Divinity* of Scripture, which every *Arian* and *Haretick* would own, were there no such thing as a *Protestant* in Being.

4. They hold on in this proofless strain, and tell us how Moral certainty is Assurance enough, that Christian Religion is infallibly true. Be it so, it is nothing to the purpose; For we enquire not in this place after the moral Evidence of Christian Religion in General, which, as it professed by condemned *Hereticks*, hath none; But we ask for the moral Certainty, wherby *Protestancy* is evidenced. This is not so much as Spoken of, though the Title of *resolving Protestants Faith* requires a direct Answer to this Difficulty. They say again, *There can be no greater then moral Certainty for the main Foundations of all Religion, and the chiefest in the Existency and Being of God.* The Assertion is false, as I could demonstrate, were it now pertinent to handle that question. But Let it pass. Give us, I beseech you, as much Moral certainty of Protestant Religion, as All acknowledge for the Existency of a Deity, and we are satisfied; But of this we hear not a word. We have Talk enough of the Moral certainty of Christian Religion, which Answers not to the Title of *resolving Protestants Faith*.

5. They say thirdly. Suppose, God gives the most infallible Evidence of any Religion, some who are bound to believe that Religion, can have no more then Moral certainty of it. *Transcat totum*, at present. What makes it for *Protestancy*? We here ask, Why Protestants believe as they do? Why They adhere to their

Protestancy
unavoid-
ed.

*They An-
swer not to
the difficult-*

new Faith, and preſerr that Before all other Religions? Rational Motives Can be produced, or not. We hitherto hear of none, And therefore ſuſpect, yea, know very well, there are none for it.

*Proteſtants
altogether
in Gene-
ralls.*

6. They ſay fourthly. *Moral certainty yeilds us ſufficient Assurance that Chriſtian Religion is infallibly true.* What Religion is infallibly true upon moral certainty. Is it *Arianism* or *Pelagianism*? No. Is it the Roman Catholick Religion? No. Is it Proteſtancy? Yes. Then produce Rational Motives which may ground a moral certainty more of this Religion, then of any other Sect, and we acquieſce. But this you cannot do.

*And prove
nothing for
their Reli-
gion.*

7. They ſay fifthly. *Where there is evident credibility in the matter propounded, there doth ariſe upon Men an obligation to believe.* Very good! To believe, what. Give us this evident Credibility of Proteſtancy, and ſomething is ſaid to the purpoſe. Hereof yet we have no news, nor are like to have, and conſequently Proteſtants cannot be obliged to Believe as they do. After ſome other Parergons,

8. They ſay ſixthly. *The laſt Reſolution of Faith is not into the infallibility of the instrument of conveyance, but into the infallibility of that Doctrin which is thereby conveyed to us.* Shall we eternally have theſe Empty words, and no Subſtance? You talk here of an infallibility of Doctrin, and we would have the Riddle expounded. Is it the Roman Catholick Doctrin? Or yours? Or *Arianism*? What for Gods ſake, avail's it to hear a noiſe of infallible Doctrin, and not to know, who rightly profeſſeth it? Your Doctrin therfore of Proteſtancy is to be Evidenced, this is all we look for.

9. They

9. They say seventhly. *If the Doctrin of Christ be true and Divine, then all the promises made were accomplished: Now that was one of the greatest, that his Spirit should lead his Apostles into all Truth.* Very true. But what is this for Protestant Doctrin? We ask still by what Signs and Marks of Truth, do these new Men prove their particular Faith to be Apostolical? Here only lyes the Difficulty, never touched on by them. Admit therefore at present, that they have in their hands the infallible Records of Gods Word, they are far off yet from proving their particular Doctrin of Protestancy to be Scripture, or the infallible Word of God. This is the sole controverted Question between us.

10. They finally end. *Thus much may suffice in general concerning the Protestant way of resolving Faith.* Very little, it seems, serves their turn, who hitherto never medled with that Resolution; But have lost their labour, by a talking in General of Christian Religion, which no more concern's Protestancy, then it doth the worst of Hæreticks: And after this manner They hold on in another Chapter entituled. *The sense of Fathers in this Controversy;* Where Iustin Martyr, Irenaus, and Clements of Alexandria are cited. but to what purpose God only knows. Are they quoted to evidence any thing like Protestancy? No. The whole Discours of these Learned Fathers look's another way, and never medles with this Novelty. Read them as they are, either in These Authors (with all the Advantages of their Glosses on them) or rather in the Originals, as I have don exactly, you will find them so great Strangers to this new Hæresy, That they never thought of it. To transcribe again their whole Discours.

Lost labour to talk of Christian Religion in General.

Fathers cited to no purpose.

would prove tedious, read *Iustins* words in these Authors *Part. 1. Chap. 9. page 264.* and add to them the reflection made *page 265.* What part (say they) is there now of our Resolution of Faith which is not here in (that is in *Iustins* Testimony) asserted? I answer, Nothing at all, as will appear by your own Questions and Answers wholly irrelative to Protestancy. Thus then you go on.

Iustin makes nothing for Protestants. If you ask why you believe there were such men in the world as these Prophets wherof *Iustin* speaks. Answer. The continuance of their Books and common Fame sufficiently attest it. Be is so, what is this to Protestancy?

Weak inferences,

Can any one probably infer, Because He believes there were such men in the world as Prophet, Apostles, or Evangelists, Therefore he hath the true Doctrine of these Prophets? No. For both *Arians* and *Pelagians* yeild Assent to that general Truth, and so do Catholics also; are all These right in Faith upon that Account precisely? Toyes. No more then are Protestants. 3. If you ask, say you, why you Believe them to be true Prophets? Answ. The excellency of their Doctrine joyned with the fulfilling of Prophecies, and working Miracles, abundantly prove it. Prove what for Gods sake? No more but this, that those Prophets taught excellent Doctrine, and wrought Miracles; Doth it therefore follow that Protestants, Arians, and other Hæreticks teach such Doctrine, or work Miracles? No. Herein lyes the Difficulty, not so much as glanced at, or touched on. And thus they run on to no purpose for many pages, with Testimonies drawn out of *Irenæus*, and *Clement Alexandrinus*, which no more relate to Protestancy then those

Not Clement Alex.

Disc.I. C.IX. In this Matter of Motives. 95

those first Words of *Genesis* do: *In the beginning God created Heaven and Earth.* Nay more. Clemens cited by these Authors, page 273. expressly confutes our Sectaries, whilst he requires two things necessary to attain to the true knowledge of true Faith in *Christ*, *Zeal*, and *inquiry*: the Enquiry and Discovery of it. *The Enquiry is an impulse of the mind* (say these men) *for finding Truth out, by Signs which are proper to it.* *Discovery, is the End and Rest of this Enquiry, which lyes in the comprehension of the things, which is properly knowledge.* A most true and admirable Expression. Clemens according to these Authors, proceeds thus. *Now the Signs by which Truth is Discovered, are either Precedent, Concomitant, or Subsequent.* *The precedent Signs, whereby we discover Christ to be the Son of God, are the Prophecies declaring his coming.* *The Concomitant, were the Testimonies concerning his Birth.* *The subsequent Signs, are those Miracles which were published and manifestly shewed to the World after his Ascension, &c.* Most true and Divine Doctrin, which is entirely for the Roman Catholick Religion, and against Protestants. Why? We enquire after the precedent Signs, whereby their new Religion is discovered? We ask for subsequent Signs, which were publickly known to the world soon after the broaching of their new Faith, and yet cannot hear of any shewed by these new men in confirmation of their Faith. Finally, we urge for Miracles and other Prudential Motives Evidencing Protestant Religion in the ensuing Chapter (but find none.) Read it, and give an impartial judgement.

But Con-
futes them.

CHAP.

C H A P. X.

*Protestants have no rational Motives,
wherby their new Faith is evidenced
to be so much as probable.*

1. **T**O prove the Assertion, we here friendly demand, Whether, when Scripture, Fathers, and the best Authority of former ages Assert, That the Marks and Cognisances of Gods revealed Truth, are as follow. *Antiquity, A Lawful mission, Unity, Efficacy of Doctrin, Universality, Miracles, Succession of Bishops, Sanctity*, yes, and the very name of *Catholik &c.* My demand, I say, is whether our new Men will own these old Signs as lawful and approved Manifestations of Truth, or disown them? If this latter; They are Compelled to shew them unfit or forceles Arguments for the evidencing of Truth, and consequently are obliged to produce others more clear and *perswasive* for their supposed true Religion, which is impossible. On the other side, if they shall please to own them as lawful *Cognisances* of Truth, My Task is to prove, That they have neither the *complexum* of all these Motives together; nor, so much as one of them in particular for *Protestancy*.

*Protestants
own An-
tiquity.*

2. Antiquity (granted to Popery; for at least a thousand years and upward) Protestants have not. Those

Those two Brethren of Iniquity *Luther* and *Calvin*, first brought this Religion forth, as is evident by all known History. Before their dayes, no man can shew me, so much as one Town, Village, or Household of Protestants.

3. Lawful Mission (most justly and without dispute challeng'd by Catholick Doctors) These two wretched men had not, (no more have their followers) Enquire after it, you will find them all un-sent Preachers, contrary to the Apostles Doctrine *Rom. 10. How shall They preach unless they be sent?* They never had licence to talk as they did; But by their own Will and unknown Spirit, which as well authorized *James Nayler* to be *Christ*, as them to be lawful and Apostolical Preachers. Say, I beseech you, when the blessed Apostles first taught the Doctrine of *Christ Iesus*, and by their preaching turn'd Idolatry out of the World, Did They only *word* it, or, without Commission talk of a new Gospel? No. *As my Father sent me*, saith our Saviour. *Joan. 20. so I send you*; And They evidenced their Calling to the great Work they had in hand, by clear and undoubted *Miracles*, which proved forcible perswasive *Arguments*, and strongly wrought upon the most obdurate Harts. Yer, fifteen hundred years after, our Novellists appear, broach a new Gospel, aym at no les a matter then to pull down the Idolatrous Babel of Popery, (so they stile our Ancient Church) and we must take their *word* for all They say, though they neither shew Letter-missive, or Patents to warrant their Doctrine, no, nor one miracle to confirm it. So destitute they are both of

A lawful Mission is wanting.

Christ and his Apostles were sent, and shewed their Mission.

N

ordi-

98 Disc.I.C.X. *Sectaries have no Motives*

*Sectaries
wordis,
without
proof.*

ordinary and extraordinary Mission. Some will say. Though they preach without Mission, they preach the Doctrin delivered in Scripture, and the Ancient Miracles (without need of new ones) were wrought to confirm Scripture-doctrin, which is now purely taught in the Reformed Churches, and not in the Church of Rome. Thus most pittifully *Mr. Poole* pag. 195. where you se first, an unlearned begging the Question. 2. Every Arian licenced to assert for himself, what *Mr. Poole* too simply assumes here without Proof. 3. This is most fals Doctrin, For no man yet ever lawfully preached true Christian Doctrin (no not *Christ* himself) without a Mission: *Sicut misit me Pater &c.* For, when He Blessed Lord, first established the Doctrin of Christianity contrary both to *Jewes* and *Infidels*, He did it not by Words only without Commission, nor proved the Verity of his Gospel by the Ancient and long since past Miracles wrought amongst the Jewes, as these men do their Doctrin by the Primitive Miracles of Christianity (*which belong not to them*;) But He evidenced it, and confirmed it, by new manifest Miracles, *visible Signs* and *Wonders*. And thus our Protestants should have don, when they first published their new *unheard of learning*, and by it attempted to throw down that long standing Church of Popery. Undoubted Miracles, unquestioned Signs of Truth should, as we read of the primitive Apostles *Mark* 16. 20. Have followed them also. But in lieu of these what have you? Unwarranted talk, meer proofles Words of *uncommissioned men*. *Miraculous words indeed, if able to subvert an Ancient Church,*

*Protestants
obliged to
show un-
doubted
Marks and
Signs,
when they
preach a
new Gospel.*

Disc. I. C. X. To prove their Faith. 99

Church, to pull down Popery, and build up Protestantcy.

4. Unity in Doctrin (most known and remarkable in the Catholick Church) they have none, witness those innumerable Sects which now swarm amongst them, and This new Faith hath produced of *Armianians, Zwinglians, Brownists, Independents &c.* And now our late *Quakers* are sprouted out of it, the last spring; perhaps, (though no body knows) of this Reformed Gospel. I need not to say much on this point. A serious thought cast upon the different procedure of a Catholick and Protestant, will lay open the great Blessing of Vnity in the one, and the contrary Curse of Division in the other. Observe well. Catholicks you shall find like right Noble men, *Standing upon a long continued Pedegree, on their Ancients Tradition, on their never interrupted Succession of Popes, of Princes, of Bishops, of People united in one Belief.* You look on Protestants like new *Vpstarts*, unfortunately divided in their very first *Progenitors, Luther and Calvin*, that begot them in discord, And this Spirit of Division, as a Ghost, doth, and will Hunt them to the worlds end, if they last so long. Catholicks you will find, like deep and silent Waters running together in one Channel, *concentred in one Principle, settled on one Rock, the Churches Infallibility.* You see Protestants, not only destroying both Rock and Center, But also so giddily *uncon-*stant to their own Tenents, that you have them at a stand no where, And this often shifting hath undone them. Once the 39. articles were points of Faith and Religion, now they are no more so. Once the Pope was *Antichrist*, now with many Pro-

No Vnity
of Doctrin.

The Blessing of Vnity, and Curse of Division.

uncon-
stant.
uncon-
stant.

testants he is the first *Patriarch*. Once he was a *horned Beast*, now more then one of our New men take of his Hornes, and make him *Rational*. Once Rome was the *Whore* of *Babylon*, now with most, it is purer, yes, and Orthodox in fundamentals. Once our Bishops were all Idolaters, unlawful Pastors; now They are so Legitimate, that our new men must either derive their Ordination from them, or have none at all. And thus unsteedily they dance up and down, say and unsay, *Now yea*, now *no*, as the Fancy takes them, And they must do so, until they have a firmer ground of Vnity to set footing on.

*Mr. Pooles
instance of
Pagans and
Devils
against
Vnity is
impertinent.*

5. *Mr. Poole* page 201. to impugn the Vnity of the Church tell's us, That both Pagans and Devils had it; yet, in the very next page complains much of the want of Vnity in his *Protestant Brethren*. Methinks *unreasonably enough*, For if Vnity be so proper to *Pagans* and *Devils*, the more Protestants are devided, The better it is for them, Because further of from the *Spirit* of these agreeing Monsters. But, saith *Mr. Poole*, Vnity without Verity is not to be regarded. I answer. Every one knows so much; But what is that to our present purpose, where we solely treat of Vnity, and assert it, with the *Nicene* Fathers, to be a Grace or Dowry of the Church, a Badge or Cognisance of Truth? And this our Protestants must acknowledge, who I hope will grant some large *Christian Society* agreeing at least in Fundamentals, which they call the *Catholic Church*. I ask therefore, Whether such an Vnity, extended to all Christians, be not Laudable, and a good Mark of Truth? If so; Why are Pagans and Devils introduced

*Protestants
hold some
Vnity lau-
dable in
the Church*

to

to slight the Churches Vnity? If not. We have now not one laudable united *Catholick Church* in the whole world. What follows in *Mr. Pools* 203 page, concerning Divisions between *Dominicans* and *Jesuits* &c Is so profoundly simple, that no mans patience can so much as hear it. Every *Puny* knows these differences are not in *Faith*, but *Opinions* only. I pass by such trifles.

*Mr. Poles
simple Ob-
jection.*

6. Efficacy in Doctrine (an undeniable Mark of the *Catholick Church*) our Protestants have not. Observe my proof. It is most certain, That these men came but late into the Vineyard of the Church (sure after the eleventh houre) and found it, as They say, in a Sad condition, overgrown with Weeds of Popish Errors, pestered with Arian, and Græcian Hæreticks, opposed by Heathens and Infidels. All these needed the Light of this new Gospel to shine upon them. And who would not have expected, before this day, greater Conversions wrought among so many straying Souls by these new Zelots? Popery ere now should have been dissipated, Arians reclaimed, Thousands of Infidels converted to *Christ*, *Dauids* courage long ago should have defeated some one or other of these massy bodies, chiefly that of Popery. But the ill success they have had in such Conversions, proves them, if not down-right Cowards, at least unlucky Combatants. Popery holds still its posture, maugre their weak attempts against it; And I never yet heard of good don upon Arians, or other Ancient Hæreticks by these mens labour. Now touching the Conversion of Infidels, Strangers to *Christ*, the As-

*No Efficacy
in Doctri-
ne.*

*What our
new Zela-
ots should
have done.*

*Sectaries
ill success
in Conver-
sions.*

*What one
Blessed
man did in
the space of
Eleven
years.*

sertion of *Thomas Bosius* Tom. 1. *De signis Ecclesiæ* lib. 6. cap. 3. *Signo* 20. is Remarkable, viz. That one Blessed man of our age, *S. Francis Xavierius*, reduced more to the Catholick Faith in the space of eleven years only, Then all the Protestants in the world (add to them what other Sectaries soever) have gained of *Infidels* to their Hæresies, since the beginning of Christianity. My God! Had the Blessed Apostles been as slow in rooting out Idolatry, as our late Masters yet are lazy about so noble a Work*, the dumb Idols of the Gentils would have preached against them, and still stood unshaken. But, God gave These first powerful Preachers and their Catholick Followers, a *vigorous Spirit*, the *Efficacy of Doctrin*, an illustrious Character or mark of Truth, which to this day the Church wear's, and manifesteth to the world. Sectaries never had it.

Few Infidels reduced by Protestants.

7. You will say they have yet gained many to their Protestant Profession. What History relates them, I beseech you, If we speak of *reduced Infidels*? If we mention others whose Progenitors, at least, were Catholicks, you may boldly say it. They, with the help of Secular power, have perverted many a poor Soul by preaching Liberty, which corrupted nature as easily follows as a stone fall's downward. *Faith only justifies. Good works are of no value. Fasting is superstition. Mortification is Popery. The use of Penance is needles.* And yet worse, might modesty speak it, *if she will not* &c. Tenents, more fit for Devils, then Doctors to preach; yet Christians have heard such Libertins talk.

How Hæresies bath gained followers.

8. May I upon this occasion say my Thought
con-

concerning those poor souls drawn from us to Protestantism, since the unhappy breach began in England? I conceive it thus: A certain indifferent careless Humor of having this or that Religion, Any or none (Heresy first brought it in, and it tend's to Atheism) got them some company. Home-bred Education, that see's little abroad (As it must needs happen to them that live in an Ileland) has brought in more. The Penal Lawes, and the fear of losing a temporal Fortune, has forc'd in very many. Ignorance, peevishly perverse in Some, and deplorable in Others, greatly encreased the number. But, above all that Liberty, now mentioned, to Do, and Believe what every man listeth (a Sauce that suits best with unsetled Stomacks, we may call it *Luther's Ratsbain*) hath allured innumerable. In one of these Classes, you will find them, except perhaps some of the more Learned (whose consciences I touch not) God only knows, what Grypes they feel, for misleading others, and wronging Themselves. But, what will ye? 'Tis Interest. Their fat Benefices, that timely follow the low fortune they were born to, hold's them fast. It must be a powerful Grace, that can so much as stirr them, much more that can draw them from their Heresy.

A careless humor first brought in by Heresy. Home-bred Education.

Penal Laws. Ignorance, perverse in some, deplorable in others. But above all Liberty encreased the number.

9. Set these Classes aside, the Churches in England would, I think, be very Empty of company. There are few or none among the Abler sort, that are much in love with *Protestancy* upon the account of Religion. Yet more, We find by experience, that when those First sort of men now named have some feeling of God, and Eternity, when the Second

Saw of the more able are in love with Protestancy.

step

step out of England, and see the Practice of Catholick Religion in neighbouring Countries: When the Third, dare loose a little *mammon* for God: When the Fourth Hot Spirits are somewhat cooled, And the poor Beguiled get open their eyes: When the Fifth have done with Youth and Liberty, (of the Sixth I say nothing but, *God help them.*) Experience I say learn's us, That all of them draw neerer to Catholick Religion, so far at least, as to judge well and Honorably of it, and we see not a few turn good old Papists, when they come to dye (men deal then most seriously) Though I never yet heard of any, that had lived Catholick, desert his Faith upon Scruple, as nor being in a right Belief, or *dye a Protestant.*

*Many at
their death
become Ca-
tholicks,
few or none
turn to be
Protestants*

*Protestant
have no
universa-
lity,
Of Time,*

Not Place,

10. Universality, which the very name of *Catholick* implies, and the Apostles Creed allows of, is no *Mark* of Protestant Religion. If we relate to time, Not one Age, ever since *Christ* came into the world, can produce so much as one slender Family of Protestants before *Luther*. This point hath been often press't, but never yet had Answer. For place, it is as meanly poor; For take this Religion in the greatest Latitude, as it is made up of all those jarring and dissenting People, that go under the notion of the Reformed Churches, it only creep's up and down in some few Corners of our Northren world, without *Lustre* or *Glory*. And if we speak more strictly of Protestants in England (I mean the 39. articl'd men) I believe a good large Village would hold most of them. *Mr. Poole* hath no good liking to the long Duration and Amplitude of Religion, and therefore disdainfully kik's at both with his *Pagan-instance.* Is it

not

not pittiful to mispend time on such intolerable Trifles? I'll do so no more, And therefore am with good Reason forced to wave most of Mr. Pools No-objections.

11. To the Amplitude of Catholick Religion, we may here well annex the continued Succession of Bishops, the Sanctity, and Purity of our Catholick Doctrin; both are marks of Truth and evident in the Roman Church. Protestants can lay no claim to succession, and therefore I challenge them as *Tersullian* did the Ancient Hæreticks *De præscript. Cap. 32. Edans Origines Ecclesiarum suarum, evoluant ordinem Episcoporum suorum.* Let them show us the Origin of their Churches; and declare the order of their Bishops. Let them say who they were? Where they lived? Who knew them? What good they did in the Church? *Sustinete me, & ego loquar.* Have patience, and I'll tell you. They had not so much as one Bishop, one Pastor, one Doctor, or one Preacher, before the dayes of unfortunate *Luther*, whereas the Catholick Church demonstratively gives a Catalogue of her succeeding Popes, and Bishops, from Blessed *St. Peter*, to this present Pope who now sitt's in that Chair. And if you will know of what account this perpetuated Succession of Pastors is, read *St. Austin Tom. 6. contra Epistolam fundam. cap. 4. In Catholica Ecclesia tenes me (saith the Saint) ab ipsa Sede Petri Apostoli, cui pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit, usque ad præsentem Episcopatum, successio Sacerdotum.* The continued Succession of Priests until now, from the seat of *St. Peter* the Apostle, to whom our Lord after his Resurrection commended his

Protestants have no succession of Bishops.

No Protestants Bishop or Pastor before Luther.

A continued succession of great account.

106 Disc.I. C.X. *Seclaries have no Motives*

his Flock to be fed, holds me in the Catholick Church. And afterward. No *Donatist* can shew such a Succession, no more, say I, can any Protestant. Se more in his Book *De utilitate credendi* c. 17. at those words: *Dubitamus nos ejus Ecclesia gremio cedere &c.*

*Purity of
Doctrin.*

12. Sanctity and Purity of Doctrin (which neither Infidel, nor Sectary could ever yet cavil at, But upon the account that there is too much of it, in the Catholick Church) is pittifully wanting to Protestants. I prove it. As the Tree is known by its

*Saintly Effects follow
Holy Doctrin.*

Fruit, so Holy Doctrin is best known by the Holy life of those who profess it, and the Saintly effects that follow it. If we might insist on the first, tell me, where have our Protestants Their holy *Hilarions*, their retired *Pauls* and *Antonies*, their *Gregories*, their *Bernards*, their *Malachies*? Where have they Apostles Like *S. Austin* of England? Bishops of such Austerity as a *S. Charles Borromeus*? Doctors so profoundly learned and humble, as *S. Thomas of Aquine*, and *S. Bonaventura*? Where are their undefatigable Missioners, sent for Conversions to the remotest parts of the world with a Blessed *S. Xaverius*? Where are their Mortified Religious, their Solitary Monks, their Tender Virgins shut up in Cloysters without hope of enjoying the world, or Friends any more? Such Holines manifest's it self in the Catholick Church; Protestants have nothing like it, and yet those two impuse Founders of the new Gospel, *Luther* and *Calvin*, had far Les of Sanctity.

*Sanctity
manifest.*

A parallel,

Let every Conscience speak its own Thought, and say plainly, whether these Two now named, were Patterns of Vertue like a Renowned

S. B.

S. Bonet, a Glorious *S. Dominick*, an Humble *S. Francis*, a Prudent *S. Ignatius*, who endeavored (not to amend the Church ever sound in Doctrin) But only to better the world by their Incessant labours, by their Charitable works, and Blessed example. Heaven now crowns these Saints with Glory, and earth yet celebrates their Memory with immortal Praise, whilst *Luther* and *Calvin* lye buried in Oblivion, only thought on for founding a Gospel upon Liberty, which makes all the Followers of it Libertins, and therefore we must acknowledge that Christianity hath been much worse for their once being *Christians*. *Protestancy ruin's All.* More Atheistical Principles have been settled in mens Harts, since these two new *Preachers* came amongst us, more Phantastick Opinions vented, more Kingdoms undone, more Common-wealths ruined, more Innocent blood shed, after this Tragical Gospel got footing, than before were heard of for a thousand years together in time of Popeny. And

13. Here we may briefly touch something on those sad Effects, which have followed Protestant Doctrin, And (setting Passion aside) friendly ask of any Impartial man, what good hath this new Religion don in the world? What amendment hath it made in Life and Manners? What Conversions hath it wrought amongst Heathens and Infidels? What Sanctity hath it yet shewed us in the Professors of it? What Churches hath it built? What Hospitals hath it erected? What Universities hath it founded, either comparable to our Ancient or modern Catholicks? All runn's on in a Contrary strain. Ruins, gasty ruins follow these men where ever they go, to the

Horror of those who have Eyes to see, and Hearts to deplore the sad Spectacles yet left of their impious Sacriledge, and worse then Barbarous Reformation, viz. Of our Churches defaced, of our Cloysters demolished, of our Altars and Monuments pulled down (whilst yet they live on our Revenues) as if the very Memory of *Christ* and the Temples, where once he was Worshiped, were grown abominable to these *new Spirits*. And why all this Confusion for a *new nothing*? O Strange and Prodigious Spirit! what shall I say of thee? Thy Doings are only to undo, thy Building to destroy, thy Piety is to prophane Sanctified Places. Thy Light is to bring in Horror and Darknes, thy Turning from *Christ* and his Church, hath Turned Kings out of their Thrones, Bishops out of their Sees, Religious out of their Cells, Nobles out of their Estates, Sense out of Scripture, Charity out of the World, and Men out of their wits. This Turning from *Christ* and his Church, hath Turned *Vnity* into *Schism*, *Peace* into *War*, *Religion* into *Policy*, *Virtue* into *Hypocrisy*, *Learning* into *Ignorance*. Such are the known Effects of this late Doctrin, all upon Record, reserved to the final Sentence of our most impartial Judge in the Vale of *Iosaphat*, where it will appear, whether I have wronged these men in drawing up this dreadfull Charge against them, or They themselves for such Impieties done before God and his Angels.

Objection. 14. Our Sectaries are wont to object against the Churches Sanctity, the Scandals, Pride and Luxury of Wicked men in it. *St. Austin* long since answered the Cavil. Amongst good Corne have Cockle, with
wheat

Wheat you have Chaff mingled, in a flourishing Kingdom you find Traytors, amongst marryed women (it is *S. Austins* instance) some you may have les Loyal. Are therefore all to be blamed upon the Account of some? 'Tis open Unjustice. Se *S. Austin* in his fifth Book against *Faustus cap. ultimo*, and his 137. Epistle. Blessed be Almighty God (though the guilt of Sin lyes heavily on many) yet great Sanctity is still eminent in the Church amongst all Sorts of people, whether, Princes, Prelaets, Pastors, Religious, Seculars, Rich, or Poor. Great Conversions we se dayly, not only made from Hæresy to Faith, but also from Vice to Vertue, from a looser sensual Life to great Austerity. The Rich often voluntarily become Poor, The Proud Humble, the Avaricious Liberal; the Riotous Frugal, the Impatient Meek, the Secular Religious, and quit all they have in this tumultuous World to serve God in a quiet Cell. Such changes from Worse to Better are undeniably evident in the Catholick Church, which yet *Erasmus* his acute Eye could never se amongst our New men. *Profer mihi* (saith He in his Epistle to *Vulturnus Neocomus*) *quem istud Euangelium ex commessatore sobrium &c.* Give me the Man, whom this Gospel of a Gurmandizer hath made Sober, of Fierce and cruel hath made Tractable; of an Extortioner Liberal, of a filthy Speaker fair spoken, and of an unchast liver shamefast, And I will shew you many, who are grown Wors, then they were before. Thus *Erasmus*.

All not
blamable
upon the
accounts of
some.

Evident
changes
from worse
to better.

15. Miracles, the most glorious marks of Truth, manifested in our Saviour *Iohn* 15. 24. wrought by his Apostles *Mark* 16. 17. and amply promised to those who Believe in *Christ*, *Iohn* 14. 12. The Roman Catho-
lick Church

Miracles,
the most
glorious
Marks of
Christ's
Church

¶ 110 Disc. I. C. X. *Secularies have no Motives*

lick' Church hath from Age to Age undeniably Evidenced (and the only) if we speak of *clear and undoubted Miracles* ; I mean of such as answer in *Analogy* and *Proportion* to our Saviours works. *The Blind se, the Lame walk, The Lepers are cleansed, the Deaf hear, the Dead rise &c.* These are the Churches Miracles. Never had our Protestants, or other H^{er}eticks any like them. Read *Coccinus* and *Bellarmin* of *Martin Luthers* and *Calvins* famous Miracles, The story is notoriously known. I wave it.

Of ancient Miracles. 16. Of Ancient Miracles, se *Irenaeus advers. Hares. lib. 2. cap. 57.* *S. Ambros. Serm. 91.* *S. Austin lib. 22. de Civit. cap. 8.* *Theodoret* in his 8. Books *de curan. Grac.* *Affect S. Hierom* against *Vigilantius*; *Ruffinus*, *S. Gregory* with others. And for the more Modern, be pleased only to read *Iustus Lipsius* (a man of Credit and Reputation) in his 3. Tome, *Antwerpe print anno 1637.* towards the end with these Titles *Divæ Virgo Hallensis, Divæ Sicheniensis.* It is but time cast away to say more on this Subject, most largely handled by our Writers, who produce their Proofs, answer to all contrary Cavils, and cite their Authors of *unquestioned Authority*, Both for pass't and present Miracles.

Cavils of Secularies against Miracles. 17. And here, because we mention Cavils, read first, I beseech you, those Sacred Words of our Saviour *John 14. 12.* *Amen, Amen, I say unto you, he that Believes in me, the works that I do, shall he do also, and greater works then those shall he do &c.* Next he pleased to say whether he Cavils not, that Asserts these great Works and Wonders to have ceased after the time of *Christ* and his Apostles, when not only approved History relates them, but Reason also pleads strongly for

Disc. I. C. X. To prove their Faith. III

for their Continuance in ensuing Ages. For, had these Glorious marks of Truth failed in the Church as our Protestants would have it (Because they have none) Christian Faith ere this day (believe it) would have grown cold in the Hearts of thousands and thousands. Therefore to prevent Incredulity, the Wise Providence of God, rowseth them up, and quickens their Belief with these forcible Incitements, which neither Infidels can Deny, nor Hæreticks own. Again. Miracles were necessary in the Beginning of the Church to demonstrate the Verity of Christian Religion against Jewes and Infidels; But there is the like Necessity of them still for these mens Conversion; All are not yet Reclaimed, nor will Believe Scripture without farther Evidence.

Why Miracles continue in the Church?

Miracles still necessary.

18. The Cavils of Sectaries against Miracles are briefly reduced to these Heads. Some say They are done by the help of the Devil. First, how know they that? 2. Such was the course and untrue Language of the Jewes against Christ, Luk 11. 2. 15. He cast out Devils, and Devils help't him. 3. Why are not such Miracles wrought by Arians or other Hæreticks, who surely come neerer Devillish Doctrin then Catholicks? They object again. We know not by Infallible and certain Faith, that these Miracles, recounted in history, were done. I answer, No more did the Primitive Christians, who beheld Christs Miracles, know them by Faith; For, they first saw them, and afterward Believed. We have therefore Indubitable moral Assurance of these wonders, and that's enough. They say, 3. Many Miracles are Fained, and perhaps not truly related. To the first I answer.

Objections answered.

Gen-

¶ 11 Disc. I. C. X. *Seſtaries have no Motives*

*The Gen-
tills might
have Ca-
villed at
Chriſts
Miracles as
Seſtaries
do at the
Churches.*

*We rely on
no doubtful
Miracles.*

*Seſtaries
believe fa-
bles and
deny Credit
to Authen-
tick Hiſto-
ry.*

Gentils might have in like manner Cavilled at *Chriſts* own Miracles, and ſaid they were Fained, yea, and at true Scripture alſo, Becauſe counterfeit Goſpels have been writ. Know then, we ſpeak not here of either Fained, or Doubtful Miracles, But of ſuch as are Clear, Viſible, moſt ſeverely examined, *Aſſeſſed* upon oath, And manifeſtly proved, before they receive warrant from either Church or Prelate. We have innumerable of Theſe.

19. To the ſecond I anſwer. Though Miracles only recounted in Hiſtory, are leſſe aſſured then others approved by the Church, yet it is a degree of madneſs to deny them all; And if ſome only of thoſe *many* be True, we have our Intent. By the way, pray you, obſerve a pretty Humor of our Proteſtants. If theſe men read a Story (though never ſo Unauthentick) to the diſgrace of a Pope, of a Prelate, of the Clergy or Religious, *Pradicant*, *Clamitant*, They noiſe it all abroad, and vent it openly in Print, as moſt precious ware, And all are bound to believe it; But when a very Saint, or a choiſe Hiſtorian writ's of a Miracle, Tell's the Time, the Place, the Circumſtances, and make it morally Indubitable, That is decry'd as an Impoſture, a Dream, a forg'd Tale, a meer Fiction and what not? Is this think ye Evangelical Sincerity? They object 4. Both Heathens and Hæreticks had Miracles amongst them (*Mr. Poole* I think ſomewhere Trifles with the Wonders of Heathens and *Apollonius Tyanæus*;) Ergo They are not Signs of Truths. Obſerve firſt, how the Argument (if of any Strength) ſtrikes with equal force at *Chriſts* Miracles, as it doth at the Churches.

I anſwer therefore with *St. Auſtin*:
The

The Miracles of Heathens and Hereticks not comparable with those of the Church.

The few seeming Miracles of Heathens, or Hæreticks, are not comparable to those of the Church, either in Power, Greatness, Continuance, Splendor, or Majesty. These as far go beyond the other in Worth and Excellency, as the raising of a dead man to life surpasses the taking a little water in a sieve, or cutting of a whetstone asunder with a Razor; all sleight work feasible by Conjurors and the Devils' help, and much of that nature, of those Egyptian wonders done before Moses. Whence it is that Blessed St. Austin little esteem'd the Donatists Miracles, and those of other Hæreticks. *Aus falluntur, aut fallunt*, saith the Saint, they either are deceived, or deceive. So him in his *Hom. 13. in Joannem*, and more *de Civitat. lib. 10. c. 16.* and in his Book *de Utilit. cred. c. 16.* Concerning the name of Catholick which Protestants never had, nor Those they Nick-name *Papists* (a word newly coyned with their Gospel) ever yet lost, Read St. Austin *contra Epist. fondam. cap. 4.* and *de utilit. cred. cap. 7.* *Christianus mihi nomen est*: (saith the Ancient *Pacianus* (*Catholicum cognomen*, *illud me nuncupat; istud ostendit.*) Christian is my Name, and Catholick my Surname, that indeed names me, but this declares what I am, And in both these we Catholics Glory.

C H A P. XL

*Arguments drawn from Reason against
Protestants, upon the consideration
of These declared Motives.*

Two Churches
are very
different.

1. **W**E have seen already both the Weaknes and Strength, the Obscurity and Glory of two different Churches, Protestant and Catholick. The first pittifully Naked, The other richly Adorned with such *Noble Marks of Truth*, as force Reason to give a final Sentence, and say, If Religion be in the world, it must be found amongst those Christians who demonstrate it Credible with most urgent and convincing Motives. But this Catholick Religion only doe's, and not Protestancy: For Protestants (I Assert it boldly) have not so much as one Rational Motive (much les the *complexum* of all now related) that works upon Prudence, and (Antecedently to their new Faith) makes them Believe as they do. If They have any such, my earnest petition is to hear of Them, or se them clearly layd forth to the Reason of other men; or, if They fail in this (as of necessity they must) let them Speak the plain Truth, *Viz.* That all *They Write and Preach*, is *lost labor*, whilst they go about to draw Rational men to a Religion, for which there is no Reason. And

2. Here I answer to the trivial Talk of Protestants (pretending to follow Reason in all they Believe) and
once

once more Assert. They have nothing like a shadow of Reason *previous to their Faith*, either for their new Religion in *General*, or any particular *Tenent* in it. To prove my Assertion, We must distinguish between the prudent Inducements that draw one to Believe, and the *Elicit Act of Faith is self*. These Inducement Precede Faith, and are properly the Object of Discours. Faith solely relies on Gods Revealed *Testimony*, without the mixture of Reason for its *Motive*. The Previous motives well pondered, bring with them an Obligation of Believing, and not Faith it self: For no man saith. *I am obliged to believe; Because I believe; But therefore I believe, Because antecedently to my Faith, I find my self obliged upon Prudent Reasons to believe as I do.* Thus much supposed.

Protestants have no shadow of Reason for their new Religion.

3. Make a search into all the Motives imaginable, that may Prudently induce a Seeker after Truth, to embrace Protestant Religion, you shall find nothing proposed to Reason, That hath the Appearance of Reason in it. For example. Ask first in *General*, upon what Motive *Extrinsical* to their Faith, do these men own Protestancy, as the only true and pure Religion? Why dare they so boldly prefer it before the Faith of the long standing Catholick Church, yea, or before that of their homebred Sectaries, of *Quakers* and *Independents*? Silence will prove the best Answer, They can Shew no Motive at all. Perhaps we may hear them say, They reject the Ancient Church because of its Errors, and Novelties. If so, They first lamentably beg the question, and Suppose that, which is yet to be Proved. 2. They answer not to the Difficulty. For grant (which is utterly fal-

116 Disc. L.C.XI. Arguments against Sectaries

se) that the Church hath erred, we ask not here for Arguments to Refute those Errors, But inquire after Rational and perswasive Motives, whereby Truth is proved to stand on the Protestant side? A poor Comfort, God know's, it is for me, To hear from a Protestant, that my Religion is not Right, unless upon weighty Reasons He convinces me that he is better. For, say I, If the old Religion be naught, This new one may be worse, and more erroneous. Sectaries are therefore oblig'd to bring in palpable Evidences, whereby their Religion is positively demonstrated Credible and only the best, which shall never be done.

A poor Comfort, to learn that my Religion is not good unless it varies prove theirs to be better.

Recourse to Scripture clear's not the difficulty.

Protestants have no Motives to believe contrary to the Church Or contrary to the Quakers.

4. If yet, to answer the Difficulty, They take post to Scripture for Proof of their Religion, They are out of the way, and at the Conclusion before they put the Premises. For in this place we make no inquiry after their formal act of Faith, nor the immediate Object therof, (we know well their Answer) But only Ask for the Rational Motive (perceptible by all) that preced's Faith, and Prudently obligeth them to believe, contrary both to the Ancient Church and their own honest Quakers; And this (if the Reply be pertinent) must be evidenced, Before they talk of a new Faith grounded on Scripture. Had the Primitive Christians, when they left of Judaism and Beleiv'd Christ, been Ask't. Why they received Christ's Doctrin, and preferred that before their old Religion, They would have answered: *The blind se, the lame walk, the dead arise &c. We behold strange Wonders with our eyes, which powerfully work upon Reason, and cannot but proceed from God.* When therefore our Protestants deserted the Ancient Church, and taught a new Faith con-

contrary to it, certainly some visible Apparent wonder, some perswasive Sign of Truth should have ushered it in, and sounded the Trumpet before these new Preachers. All, convinced by Reason, should have cry'd out, *Here is Antiquity, here is Unity in Doctrine, here we see the Pedigree of our Ancient Church Shew'd forth. Now, and not before, our Eyes behold most glorious and undoubted Miracles, God certainly speaks by these new men &c.* But when we look about us, and find nothing to countenance this unknown Faith (which like a Stranger came amongst us) when we hear a Novelty preached without either Sign, Motive, or Inducement to make it Credible. When we see a new Religion brought in by uncommissioned men upon their bare parole, and unproved Fancies only: what can we think, But that both *Arians*, and *Pelagians* (yea, and all condemned *Hereticks*) have evidenced as strongly their old Errors, by a verbal venting of them, as Protestants do now their new Gospel? For beside Words you have nothing to warrant it.

5. Perhaps they will say, They are a part of Christianity, and Therefore the old Motives belong to them. I answer. No more then to *Arians* or *Pelagians*, who went as well under the name of Christians as Protestants do. O, But their Religion now professed is the Faith of the Primitive Church. I dare swear it, the *Arians*, and our modern Quakers will yet say as boldly They believe exactly the very Doctrine which pure Scripture Teaches, But there is *Χαρμῶν*, a vast distance between saying and proving what is said, by a Rational satisfactory and received Principle. I say therefore, their bare Assertion of hold-

A new Religion must have Signs of Truth and weighty Inducement.

Words only given.

Old Motives no more for Protestants than for Arians.

A claim to the Primitive Faith, no received Principle.

ing the *Primitive Faith* (which we utterly deny) is so far from being either a probable or convincing Principle for this Religion, That it must be either further proved by Rational grounds, or, it is wholly Forceles and fall's to Nothing.

3. Principles of Protestants answered.

6. They say again : They have three evident Principles to ground their new Faith on. First, *What God speak's is true.* 2. *God's pure and uncorrupted Word is in their hands.* 3. *They know what God speak's in this Word.*

I answer, the first Principle is certain. The second more then doubtful. The third, on which all Relies, and toucheth more upon *their Faith*, then on any Rational *Antecedent Motive* evidencing it, is demonstratively *improbable* : For, upon no Proof, upon no received Principle, By the light of no Rational Motive, can these men so much as meanly show, That They are better at *knowing* what God speak's in Scripture, then a whole ample learned Church, or, then Their own Ancestors both knew of old and believed for a thousand years together. These men long since deceased, held (and upon Scripture well understood) as firmly the Real Presence of *Christs* Sacred Body in the *Eucharist*, as a *Trinity* of Persons in one Divine Essence. The first, Protestants now Reject, the other they Admit, And why. Upon what Conviction, upon what Rational Motive do they take and leave, assert and deny as they list ? Press this and other like particulars home, instead of Reason or rational Proofs, you shall have Their own *reeling sentiments* given in for Answer. And thus, forsooth, it is. They read Scripture, and verily it seem's to them, It ought to be interpreted as they will have it.

Protestants Reject and Admit at pleasure.

Sectaries self-flaming no proof.

it. I Ask a Reason for this *new Seeming*, against the old received *Sense*, And that very *seeming* which is in question you have *prooflessly* returned for an answer. Observe well that I say here, and you will find Protestantism reduced to *Fancy* only.

C H A P. XII.

Protestants, for want of rational Motives cannot convert an Infidel to Christian Faith.

1. **I**T hath often occurred to me : If by a supposed *They have*
 impossibility (Schoolmen sometimes Argue so, *no way to*
 and profitably) Popish Religion were utterly exting- *Convince*
 uished, or, the Proofs thereof quite rased out of all *a Heathen*
 mens Memory; yet, that Protestants with all they can
 in justice lay claim to touching Religion, should still
 stand in the world as now They do. This Thought,
 I say, hath more then once seized on me, *Viz.* How
 mean, how poor, how destitute and *naked* a Thing
 Protestantism would appear to be in the Eyes of either
Jew, or learned *Heathen Philosopher*; For all it hath (if
 yet it have so much) is a borrowed Bible from others,
 But no *Miracles*, no undoubted *Marks* of Truth, no
 certain *Tradition*, no *Succession* of Ancient Bishops, no
Pastors, no *Doctors*, In fine, no *Rational Motives* (if this
 Supposition stand) can inable these *new Owners* of the
 Bible, to say with Assurance : *This Book is Gods own*
Word,

120 Disc. I. C. XII. Protestants for want of Motives
Words, and in This or this Sense God speaks by it.

A short
Dialogue
between a
Philosopher
and a Pro-
testant,

2. To clear the matter further, Imagin, That a
learned Philosopher (no Christian) curious to learn
what Christian Religion is (as we now suppose it on-
ly among Protestants and other Seditaries) should for
better satisfaction, Address himself to so wise a man
as *M.^r Poole*, who I suppose will tell the Heathen, That
God is to be Adored in a certain Religion. The
Philosopher will Answer. I doe so; For my Reli-
gion is to follow Principles of nature, to live a moral
Life, to submit to the Government I am under, to do
as I would be done by, And here is All. O, saith
M.^r Poole: Sr, you have yet greater matters to look
after, you must believe in *Christ*, if you will be saved.
Who was this *Christ*, Demand's the Philosopher?

Poole. He is God and Man, born of a Virgin, and
one that manifested himself by a most Holy Life,
wrought many Miracles, Dyed for us all, Arose from
Death to Life, and afterward Ascended to Heaven. *Phil*.
A strange Story indeed: But can you make the Story
credible to my Reason? *Poole*. O Sr, it is un-
doubted; For this, and much more, is writ in a Ho-
ly Book we call *Scripture*, And you are bound to be-
lieve it. *Phil*. In a Book called *Scripture*? Here
is no Reason, for I ask upon what Motive can you
make All that is writ in this Book credible to me?
And here (because I shall instantly press the point
farther) my Demand only is, From Whom you re-
ceived *Scripture*, and how long since it came to your
hands? We had it, saith *M.^r Poole*, about a hun-
dred years ago, partly from men that now are (sup-
pos'd) forgot. (I think they were called *Papists*) part-
ly

When, and
from whom
Seditaries
had their
Bible,

ly from other Hæreticks as *Arians*, *Gracians* of no great Credit, (for they are contrary to us.) *Phil.* And is it possible? Dare you admit of this strange and My-sterious Bible, upon no stronger proof, then the Au-thority of *Hæreticks* and such beguiled men. *Ans.* We do so, For we have no better *Testimony*. *Phil.* What Professors of Christianity had you in the world before your time, That taught truly, and purely the Do-ctrin of your Bible? *Poole.* For a thousand years at least we know not of any. The best I can mention are the later *Gracians*, and yet They highly dissent from us in points very fundamental, as I read in *Leo Alatus* against *Hottinger*, *Arcudius*, and other Authors.

Phil. Tell me once more. Had you no Professors of your *Protestancy* before these last hundred years, no Protestant Bishops, no Pastors, no Doctors, that handed unto you this Bible? *Poole.* None at all.

Phil. That is pitiful, and makes me suspect your Religion. However, since these last hundred years, have you made any known and notable *Conversions* upon Infidels by Preaching the Doctrin of your Bible, or have you wrought *undoubted Miracles* in Confirmation of its Truth? *Ans.* We must Confess the want of great *Conversions*, and of known *Miracles* also.

Phil. Satisfy me yet further in one doubt? When you are at variance amongst your selves, concerning the difficult passages of this Book (which are many, for I have read it) who have you to Reconcile those differences, in whose certain judgement do you finally Acquiesce? *Ans.* We acknowledge no *infallible Teacher*, no certain Judge on Earth, every man gives his private sentiment, concerning those difficulties,

No Pastors,
no Prote-
stant Bis-
hops.

No cer-
tain Judge to
reconcile
differences.

Q

though

122 Disc. I. C. XII. Protestants for want of Motives

No Com-
mission to
teach un-
certain Do-
ctrine.

though not infallibly, And tis not in our power to do more. Phil. Here can be no unity in Doctrine. But say on, I beseech you: Tell me who sent you to teach these uncertain Sentiments of your Bible, from whom had you Commission to preach such unsettled Doctrine? You know that in Civil affairs, if one uncommissioned assume to himself the Title of Legate, or any Dignity in a Commonwealth, he is either Traitor, Tyrant, or both. You call your selves Legats sent from God, you assume the Dignity of Priesthood, give me warrant for either, show your letters Mitive. For if you cannot, I may as prudently believe Arins old Hæresy, as your new learning. Truly Sr, replies Mr. Poole, my Answer is: The Lord, I hope, fear us; I cannot say more.

The Philo-
sophers re-
flection,

3. Here the Philosopher busies his thoughts, and *question's Reason*, whether he may in prudence ground his Belief in Christ upon a Mysteious and yet *undenied Book*, which above thousand years together, was never own'd by any true Professors of Christs, Doctrine? Whether he may do so upon the bare Word of these late men, who without *Mission* began their Preaching only a hundred years ago? Who have no unity, want *Miracles*, have made no *Conversions*, nor are able to tell him, what the Book saith in those diffical places that puzzle his understanding? It is impossible, saith he, to Acquiesce, without further Proofs drawn from Reason. Tell me therefore, good Mr. Poole, seeing Scripture, as you say, contains strange Mysteries above my Reach, and no few seeming Contradictions, which, standing in reason, rather affright, then invite me to accept of it, can you

you give me Assurance by good Motives or Arguments *extrinsecal* to the Book, That it is Divine, or writ by the *holy Ghost*, and not by Chance of Ignorance or Illusion? *Ans.* I can. First the Papists once owned this Book as Gods own hand Writing. *Phil.* O, never mention these men. They are now, as we suppose, forgotten. Surely you are able to evidence your Book, which is the sole Ground of your Faith, without Ayde or Arguments borrowed from Papists. I'll do it therefore, saith *Mr. Poole*. The Spirit of God bears witness with my Spirit, that this book is Divine, and Gods Sacred Word. I am yet an Infidel, answer's the *Philosopher*, and know little of Gods Spirit, much less of yours; my search is only after Prudent Motives, to which Reason ought to yeild and accept of this Book as Sacred and Divine. Which, S^r. you are oblig'd to produce, and not wink and fight it out with me, by an *unknown Spirit*, which in Real Truth, warrant's as well a Jew, to make good his *Talmud*, or a Turk his *Alcoran*, as you your Bible. There is yet one Argument more, saith *Mr. Poole*, to prove the Divinity of Scripture independent of *Papish Tradition*. viz. The Majesty of the Style, the Sublimity of the Doctrine, the Purity of the Matter &c. These, and the great Reverence all bear to Scripture seem powerful Inducements to admit of it, as Gods Word. *Philosop.* They are strong Fancies of your own head, and how void of all Reason, I will evidently demonstrate. First, no man can Assert that Scripture is the *Primum Cognitum*, or, *per se Notum*, a Thing known immediately by its own light, as the first Principles of

Protestance cannot prove the Holy Scripture, Not from Papists.

Nor from the Spirit.

Nor from the Majesty of Style.

Scripture is not like the first Principles in Nature.

124 Disc.I.CXII. Protestants for want of Motives

of Nature are, (which yet this *Majesty* proves or nothing;) for if so, I should see it, yea, and All without dispute, would admit of *one*, and the *same* Canon of Scripture. 2. As much Majesty appears in the Book of *Wisdom*, or *Ecclesiasticus*, which you Reject, as in the Song of *Salomon*, or, *Ecclesiastes* Admitted by you. 3. If contrary to our Supposition, we might once call to mind that now forgotten Church of Popery, There was no want (you know it well) either of exterior Lustre, *Glory*, *Majesty*, *Conversions*, *Miracles*, or, of Preaching sublime Doctrin, to set it forth : Yet this *Glory* and *Majesty* you scornfully cast of, as an Insufficient Proof for that Church ; and here without either *Conscience* or *Reason* , you Adore a far lesser *Exterior* Majesty, and by it will Out-brave me with a Book , the Truths wherof are yet as unmanifested to me by Arguments drawn from Reason , as those very Writings are , which you call *Apocryphal*.

Nor by the Purity of it, which is the thing to be proved.

4. And here by the way , observe your great Simplicity in arguing. You prove the Divinity of Scripture by the *Purity* and *Majesty* of it . The first is in question ; For I, who have perused Scripture , and find no few seeming Contradictions in it, must have my doubts cleared, and that Purity evidenced by Proofs *extrinsecal* to Scripture , before I believe it Pure . Concerning the Majesty of the *Stile* , Learn your Error . Two things are to be distinguished in Scripture . The Exterior *Syntax* or *Connexion* of the words we read , which *solely* considered is common to other pious Books writ by Holy men, without Special Assistance of the *Holy Ghost* ; And here is all the *visible Majesty* that Scripture presents , either to our eyes

The Exterior Connexion of words, not the Divinity of Scripture.

eyes or Reason, which therefore convinceth nothing. The other is (and herein consists the Vertue and Majesty of Scripture) That God by his *firm Decree*, What makes Scripture Divine. and *gracious Ordinance* hath pleased so *far* as it were, *This Book*, and own it as his Sacred Word. Now his *signature*, because *External* to the Letter or Syntax of Scripture, is no Object of Sense, nor your reason: For you do not evidence it by Antecedent rational motives. You may well say, it is the Object of your Faith, or Fancy; But, I hope, you will not prove the Divinity of your Bible by your Faith, None proves the Bible by his Faith, but his Faith by the Bible antecedently owned Sacred. The Reverence shewed to Scripture no proof. but Evidence your Faith by your Bible, Antecedently proved Divine by Reason, by good Inducements. Hence I Answer to that weak Argument drawn from the Respect and Reverence, which all give to Scripture, And say, it carrieth not one grain of Weight with it. For, even Christians (much more Infidels) must first know upon Prudent Inducements, That the Bible is Sacred, before they Reverence it, and not prove it Sacred Because they Reverence it. For none proves this man to be a Prince, or Prelate, because he doth him Homage; But therefore He complies with that duty, because he is Antecedently known or owned for a Person of such quality. Here, saith the Philosopher, are a few Exceptions against your Religion, and my Difficulties proposed. To solve them, 1. 2. 3. Believe it, old Papists hitherto forgot, must shew themselves and be remembered again. They, and only they, though we Imagin no Scripture written, are able by an Oral and never interrupted Tradition to Assure a Heathen of Christ our Lord, of the Miracles he wrought, of the Apostles he called to Found a Church.

126 Disc. LXXII. Protestants for want of Motives

And the
Scriptures.

Shew their
Creden-
tials.

And glo-
rious Marks
of a long
standing
Church.

As God
spake an-
ciently
by his
Prophets
and Apost-
les, he
spake now
by the
Church.

Church, of the great Conversions they made. They, and they alone, can warrant Authentick written Scrip-
ture, and shew who writ it, and how it was handed
down by continued Professors of their Faith Age after
Age, to this present day. They, and only they,
do still preserve Vnity in Doctrine, Reclaim Infidels,
Produce their Credentials for what they Preach, and
teach. They only can shew to all the World their
Popes, their Bishops, their Pastors, their Doctors, who
successively have taught and governed Christs Flock,
since the Beginning of Christianity. They, and only
they, shew you a Church, marked, and made glo-
rious by innumerable, known, and undoubted Mira-
cles, a Faith seal'd with the Blood of innumerable
Blessed Martyrs, Beautified with such eminent Sancti-
ty and Holynes of life in thousands, as hath caused
Admiration to very Infidels, and drawn in no few to
follow the like Austerity. Such are the Inducements
which plead strongly for the Roman Catholick Reli-
gion, and no other. They fully convince Reason,
and prove, That if God (as I noted above) can con-
quer Infidelity and Hæresy by the force of prudential
Motives, here they are seen; If ever he spoke by
the mouth of his Prophets, or Apostles, he speaks
now by the mouth of this one, and only Society of
Christians; yea, and he yet useth (as I may say) in
the same powerful Language: For if the miracles of
our Blessed Lord, and of his Apostles; if their efficacious
Doctrine, their Sanctity of life, their Blood shedding were
Conviction enough to Infidels in those days, They are
now as forceable in the Church, and as manifest to
our Senses; Which caused that Blessed man Richard de

S. Vile-

Disc. I. C. XII. Cannot convert an Infidel. 117

S. Victor lib. 1. de Trin. c. 2. to exclaim: *Si error est quem credidimus, ad se decepti sumus.* If it be error we Believe, it is you who have deceived us. *Itis enim signis &c.* For, with such Signs this Doctrin is confirmed, which can proceed from none, but you only. If we speak of unquestioned Miracles, as are the Resuscitation of dead men, More since the times of the Apostles have been raised from death to life, then in the Primitive Age. To deny these miracles, is to deny all History which supplies the want of senses in Those, who saw them not. To own them, to disown *Protestancy*, and profess plain *Popery*. Our new men Therefore speak at random, when they talk of I know not what *Abstracted Evidences* for Christian Religion, and Tell us, that the Motives for Scripture are agreed on by all. I answered above. There neither are, nor can be Motives for Christian Religion in general, if the word *Christian* compriseth all professed *Hæreticks*; For were it so, God would deceive us, and make Falshood as credible as Truth. No Motives can evidence Scripture, unless they first evidence a Church, that indubitably gives us certain Scripture; Which is to say, in other Terms: All Motives, as well for the verity of *Christian Faith* as Scripture, are only to be found in the Roman Catholic Church, and in no other Society of Christians. If Protestants can prove their Faith, or Scripture, by so much as a *likelihood* of either These now Named, or any better *Inducements*, They are obliged in Conscience to make them known, that men at last may see that clear Light of the Gospel; wherof they endlessly talk in their Pulpits. True Candor and Sin-

No Evidence for Christian Religion in general, nor for Scripture but by the Church.

Sectaries are obliged in Conscience to make their Motives known.

118 Disc. I. C. XIII. *Protestancy dishonor's Christ, and*
cerity cannot but speak plainly to this Point without
intricate Tergiversation, if so much as a spark of zeal
lives in their Harts, and Rational Motives do not
fail them. We expect a candid answer.

C H A P. XIII.

*Protestancy for want of Rational Moti-
ves dishonor's Christ, and makes
way for any new coyned Haresy.*

*Protestancy
dishonor's
Christ.*

I prove the Assertion. That Religion highly
dishonors *Christ*, which must of Necessity con-
fess, That a False erroneous Church is more emi-
nently glorious, and better marked with all evident
Signs of Truth, then that pure Orthodox Religion
is, which *Christ* hath now established in the world.
But Protestants must confess thus much, And to pro-
ve my *Minor ad hominem*, I need no more But two
certain Principles of their own. One is. The Ro-
man Catholick Religion hath been at least for a thou-
sand years Erroneous (yea some say *Anti-Christian*) it
still contradicts the Primitive Doctrin, Holds an Un-
bloody *Sacrifice*, *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory* &c. con-
trary to Scripture. Such Doctrins gave Sectaries
just cause, as they say, to leave this Church, and
Lash us so severely as they have done; to pull down
our Monasteries, to Banish the Ancient Clergy, to
Ruine those who professed our Religion. They were
not

Disc. I. C. III. *Lay's foundations for new Heresies.* 129

not meer Trifles, nor petty mistakes which made our kind barred Countrymen to use us *so unkindly*. Here is my first Principle granted by Protestants. The second is as clear, *viz.* That their new Religion of Protestancy, as it stands now Reformed, is the pure, true, and most Orthodox Christian Religion; For, set this and the Primitive Church aside of three or four hundred years continuance, You never yet had (say they) any Society of men that taught *purely Christs Doctrin*. No God wor, a Deluge of *Popish Errors* overran Christianity for a thousand years together, until these later men brought unto us the Joyful Tydings of their Refined Gospel.

2. Upon these two undeniable Suppositions, you shall plainly see what an Eternal-Disgrace; what Affronts Protestants will needs put upon our Dearest Saviour (do what we can to hinder them). He Blessed Lord founded a Church (it cost him dear, the Effusion of his Sacred Blood) and promised us an Indeficient glorious Church to be raised out of all Nations; yet after all these ample Promises, he hath given us a pittiful one indeed, no better a Thing then Protestancy, which is utterly *disgraced, obscur'd, dishonor'd*, and quite put down by the *Majesty, the Miracles, the Antiquity, the Unity, the Sanctity* of that Church which must now, forsooth, be stiled False, Erroneous, and Antichristian. If this pass for current Doctrin, you have with it sport enough for the Devil (and Protestants only make it) Who upon their warrant, may most justly reproach both *Christ* and his *Church*, and thus powerfully plead at the bar of Reason. Sayiour of the world. My false Popish Anti-

A glorious Church promised, and an obscure one shew'd us of Protestancy.

How Christ is dishonored.

130 Disc. I. C. XIII. *Protestancy dishonor's Christ, and*

*How the
Devil may
plead and
justification
make, if
Protestants
speak
Truth.*

Christian Church hath stood a thousand years in Error, yours of Protestancy only a hundred in Truth. Mine both is, and hath been Universally spread the whole World over; yours yet see's little out of some few corners in *Europe*. My Church hath had most learned General^e Councils, yours never any. Mine produceth a long continued *Succession* of Popes, of Bishops, of Pastors; yours not a man before *Luther*. Mine is glorious with those very *Notes* and *Marks* of Truth; which you manifested in your own Sacred Person, and induced Infidels to Believe you. Your late Congregation shewes nothing like them. My false Church Fasteth, Prayeth, Contemplant's, Converts more then yours, it hath more Unity in Faith; Yours is Rent and torn apieces with Divisions. And *Loe*, great God; Here is that *Glorious Edifice* which you, after all your perfect *Idea's* of a Church, have erected; For this you dyed, and never shed your Blood to Establish my false erroneous Synagogue of Popery. Permit Reason to judge in this case, and say, whether the Devil be an ill Advocate, if Protestants avouch Truth, And stand to their professed Doctrin; That the Church of Rome (drowned in a Deluge of Errors) abandoned the first Verities of Christian Religion for a thousand years together, And that their Church, as it is now in *Being*, is the most choise, goodly, and only refined Religion in the world.

*Foundation laid of
new Heresies.*

3. My last Argument hinted at in the Title is thus. A now coyned H^{er}esy, without Motives of Credibility, may be as well, or better defended by plain speaking Scripture, then Protestancy. It is, believe

Disc. I. C. XIII. *Lay's Foundations for new Hæresies.* 131

believe me, the easiest thing in the world to draw Hæresy out of the Words of Scripture. To make

good my Assertion, Read first *S. Hierom* in his Dialogue *Adversus Luciferianos*, Paris Print, anno 1509. at the very end of the Dialogue. This great Doctor

S. Hierom's Reflection.

then, to reduce some beguiled by the Luciferians, who held that a Bishop, or Priest, once Deserting their Faith, could never again be admitted into the Church, (which they endeavored to prove by that

text of *S. Matthew* cap. 5. v. 13. *You are the Salt of the earth; but if the salt hath lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?* *Ad nihilum valet ultra*, it is good for nothing hereafter &c.)

•• *S. Hierom*, I say, to refute these, hath an excellent Reflection. *Nec sibi blandian-*

tur, si de Scriptura Capitulis videntur sibi assumere &c. Let

them not flatter themselves if they seem to assume out of Scripture what they say; For the Devil hath spoken things

out of Scripture; Scripture (God know's) doth

Of Errors drawn from

not consist in what we read, but in the sense of it. *Other-Scripture:*

wise, saith the Saint, *Possumus & nos &c.* I am able to coin a new Opinion out of Scripture, and say,

That none are to be received into the Church that

wear shoes, or have two coats; For that is Scripture.

4. It were most easy to go on with this true Reflection of *S. Hierom*, and draw new Hæresies every

Particulars.

hour from Scripture. One will say: The Sabbath-day is to be kept Sacred in place of Sunday,

and bring Scripture for it *Exod.* 20. 8. Another.

That we are as well to abstain from Eating of Blood,

or things Strangled, as from Fornication; it is a Decree of the Apostolical Council, and Scripture, *Actor.*

15. 29. A third: That Infants are not to be

Bapti-

132 Disc.I.C.XIII. *Protestancy dishonor's Christ*
 Baptized, There is ground for it *Matth.* 28. A fourth:
 That we are not to Contend in Law, but quit our
 Coat, if any man will take it, and Cloak also,
Matth. 5. A fifth: That no Evangelical Preacher is
 to carry Gold or silver with him, or, have two Coats
Matth. 10. 7.

A new
 Set of
 men ri-
 sing up.

5. Suppose that a new Sect of men should rise up
 this year in whole Multitudes, and rigidly adhere to
 the exact letter of Scripture in these Particulars, is
 it possible to convince them by Scripture? It is
 impossible. And have they not, think ye, more
 plain Text's of Gods Word for these Tenents, then Pro-
 testants have for *pure Protestancy*? Yea, most evi-
 dently; For they produce nothing but express Scrip-
 ture, without Glosses. And do they not believe in
Christ, and admit of every *jota* in Scripture? Yea,
 and therefore are *sound* in *Fundamentals*. Moreover.
 Do they not acknowledge both *Christ* and Scripture
 upon the same Tradition, or other Evidences, as Protes-
 tants do? Yea, and are ready, perhaps, to joyn in
 Belief with them, when they se Scripture as plain for
 any Protestant Doctrin. They only add a Superstru-
 cture of these Articles. And have They not as good
 a Church as *Luther* and *Calvin* had a year after their
 new Preaching? Yes, They swarm with multitu-
 des of Followers, and multitudes make a Church.
 Why then is not the Belief of these men (all ground-
 ed in Scripture) as good as that of Protestants? I
 think it is (of two Evils) the Better, if more Words
 of Scripture can more advance the Worth of either
 Religion. But I tell you, and truly, That neither
 of them is good, because unreasonable; and they
 are

Have as
 good a
 Church as
 Luther
 had.

Disc. I. C. XII. *Lay's Foundation for new Heresies.* 133

are therefore unreasonable, . Because no mans Reason can in this present state of Christianity (whilst God Govern's us by the Light of Prudence) fall upon a Religion, or Believe a Church which evidently Appears naked, and destitute of all Rational motives, inductive to True Belief. Now Scripture alone, without the Interpretation of a Church evidenced by forcible Motives, is, what you please to make of it. And a Church not at all manifested by rational motives, is no Church, and Therefore cannot interpret Scripture. If you ask why we say, That Protestantism is so bare of Motives and consequently no Church? I have answered above. Because this Religion never had, nor shall have any such perswasive Inducements, or the like Signs of Truth for it, as *Christ Jesus* and his Blessed *Apostles* manifested when they first taught the World, and by virtue of those Motives, gained innumerable Souls to Christianity. Look then about you, and find me out a Society of Christians, that is evidenced by such Signs as hold a strict Analogy with those of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, and you have the True Church. But this is the Roman Catholick Church only, and no other, as I have largely proved. Dare you therefore own the true *Christ*; and his Blessed *Apostles* who wrought Miracles, lived Holily, preached Efficaciously upon such Motives? You must also own this true Church, upon the like grounded Proofs. Were Miracles, Sanctity, Efficacious Doctrin &c. Rational inducements to Believe in *Christ*? They are now both powerful and perswasive to Believe this Church. To Deny, as I said above, all Miracles to this Church, even the greatest (as is the Raising of

A Religion without prudent Motives is no Religion.

What proved Christianity anciently, proves now the Roman Catholick Church.


The forcible Motives of Faith cannot be taken from our Church. dead men to life) is to Deny *Sense, Reason, History,* and all *Authority;* And to appropriate These, and other Motives to Protestants, is only an attempted *Plagiary,* which cannot be done. It is true, These men glory in a stolen Bible, (and 'tis all they can pretend to, besides the bare name of a fruitless and unevindenced Church) but the marks and Characters of a *true Church* They shall never have, nor take from us. And thus much of infallible Teachers, and the Motives of true Faith.



T H E SECOND DISCOVERS O F SCRIPTURE.

THE FIRST CHAPTER.

Scripture is useless, if none declare infallibly the sense of it.

I. HEN on the one side I consider the Sacred Book of Scripture, enrich'd with the deep Secrets of Gods Divine Wisdom, I mean, the great Mysteries of our Christian Faith, which highly Transcend the Reach of human Reason: And on the other side, cast my thoughts on a Thing that talks of those Mysteries all alone in an English Pulpit, Professing himself fallible in all he saith, (as He must do having no other Oracle of Truth to teach him but a *Mysterious Bible*, and his own *weak Reason*) when, I say, I consider the vast Disproportion between such a fallible Master, and this infallible *Mysterious Book*, I cannot, for my life, Discover what either

A Mysterious Bible and Fallible Teachers, inconsistent.

either He, or his Bible (as 'tis used by him) is good for. It is most apparently useles and unprofitable in his hands, at least in all points of Controversies now debated amongst Christians, And thus much I will Demonstrate.

*All pretend
Scripture.*

2. To go on groundedly. Do not we see by too lamentable experience as many Strong Pretenders to Scripture, as there are or have been Sects and Religions in the world? All acknowledge the Book for Gods Sacred Word, But, highly dissent from one another, when they come to examen the particular revealed *Verities* therein concerning Religion. The Papists say this Book speaks for them: Protestants say 'tis on their Side: *Arians* deny all, and will have Scripture for them: The *Donatists* say it speak's *Donatism*: The *Quakers Quakerism*, the *Puritans Puritanism*, and so do all other Sects or Religions, even to the Bottom, call them yet as you please.

*All deliver
not the
Truths of
Scripture.*

3. It is most evident, That These Dissenting men speak not the Truth of Scripture; For they contradict one another, and in matters of High Importance. And, 'Tis as clear, They all speak not the Truths of Scripture *Infallibly*. What shall we do in this Confusion and robbing Scripture of its *Verities*? Shall every one be left to his own Spirit and Judgement of Discerning? If so, The *Arian* may be an *Arian* still, the *Socinian* a *Socinian*; the *Donatist* a *Donatist*, which is to say: Hæreticks may laudably Continue in Their Hæresy, without Restraint or Blame. Will you have an *Arian* take Mr. Pooles word, that Protestants only exactly deliver Gods *Verities* revealed in Scripture? * The *Arian* laughs at so great a folly, and tell

tell's *Mr. Poole* : Becaus we are both *fallible Men*, your Word, *Sr*, is as forceles to perswade me, That Scripture speaks what you would have it, as mine is, to work in you my contrary Opinion. What is next to be done? Shall we have Recours to the very Letter of Scripture, and hope to find Debates clearly decided between these two Disputants? It is impossi-

ble. For, the Letter of Scripture is the very thing they quarrel about; how then can it, when it occasioneth the larrs, be a *useful means* to Reconcile them? For example. The *Arian* allegeth for his Hæresy, that Text of *St. Iohn c. 14. 28.* *My Father is greater then I*, and concludes from thence that *Christ* is les then his Father, and consequently not the *High God*. So the *Arians* speak. *Mr. Poole*, to prove the Verity of *Christs* Godhead, allegeth (and thought it no robbery to be equal with God) also that of *St. Iohn 1. 5. 20.* *This is the true God*. Observe.

*Scriptura
les clear,
Occasions
dissentions,
and there-
fore cannot
End them.*

4. Here are two seeming *Antilogies* (*Christ* is less then is Father; *christ* is Equal to his Father) drawn out of two certain revealed *Verities*, which yet Scripture reconcil's not: For the whole Bible no where expressly saith, That *Christ* according to *Humain nature* is Inferiour to his Father, and Equal to him in his *God-head*; which, though a *Catholick Truth*, is not so fully expressed, as to gain an *Arian* to Believe it, who yet stands as much for Scripture as any Protestant doth. That is his *Impertinency*, saith *Mr. Poole*, Becaus he will not se Light put before his Eyes. Farwell, *Sr*, if you talk so idly. The *Arian* will storm as much at you, in not yeilding to the Express letter of his Text, *My Father is greater then I*, as you do at him,

*Two seem-
ing Anti-
logies.*

ons

S

in

Fallible interpretation
diffaisfa-
ctory.

Scripture
explicated
by Arians.

in not yeilding to yours, *He thought it no robbery &c.*
O, saith Mr. Poole, I'll explicate his Text. You explicate: And who are you? What is your Fallible explication worth? The *Arian* explicats your Text also. Se the wicked *Volkelius* in his pestiferous Book entitled *De verâ religione*, lib. 5. cap. 10. where he largely discusseth St. Pauls words: *Qui cum in forma Dei esset*, and saith first, that particle *μοεφñ*, or, *formâ*, signifies not the same nature with God; *sed speciem tantum & similitudinem*, which similitude, He deposed, taking on him the form of a servant, *Quod in Altissimum Deum cadere nequaquam potest*. Next he glosseth on those other words: *Esse se aequalem Deo*. *Dei enim est*, saith He, *tempestatibus, morbis, morti, demonibus imperare, ut nutui ejus sine morâ parere cogantur*. *Dei est, ab hominibus religiose coli atque adorari*. *Dei est, in rebus omnes hominum vires longè superantibus invocari*. Vnde efficitur, *Christum merito in Dei forma Deoque aequalem fuisse à Paulo dici, quod tantâ ab ipso potestate in omnes res Cælo subjectas donatus erat, ut mari, ventis, morbis, morti, denique summâ cum potentiâ imperaret, ideoq; à plurimis divino honoris atque invocationis cultu afficeretur, quia, videlicet, summâ hâc auctoritate atque potentiâ quam in se perpetuò manentem, cum aliis quoque communicare poterat, significq; mirandis Deum tanquam, vera ejus effigies referebat*. Thus *Volkelius*, whose Latin (to conceal his impiety) I english not. In the 11. Chap. of his fifth book, He explicates those words: *Verbum caro factum est*, and in other places confesseth, that Christ is truely the Son of God, Becaus God begot him in a particular manner by the Operation of the Holy Ghost in a Virgins womb, and Becaus he honored him with a Permanent power of working miracles, and

and other admirable Gifts *above all other Creatures*. Nay, he saith: He is true God, and *Unigenitus Patris* (but not *Altissimus Deus Creator*, of Heaven and Earth) Because the name of God is common to creatures of a lower rank than *Christ* was, who by reason of his Singular Dignity, and Supereminent *Endowments*, is to be Adored before all other creatures, whether in Heaven or Earth; And therefore merit's the Title of true God, yet not *Dei Altissimi*, of the High God.

5. I intend not, by giving you These impious Glosses of an *Hæretick*, any way to favor his execrable *Hæresy* (Though I profess ingeniously they are as good, if not better, then the best Interpretation that Mr. Poole gives of Scripture, against the Catholick Church) But only to shew you, how useles a Book, *These impious Glosses are laid forth only, to show Sc.* *Sole Scripture* is, with These men to end their Differences, yea, and what monsters are produced out of it, by those that pretend most to Gods *written Word*. And what is the reason think ye? That these *Sole-Scripturists*, These *Arians*, These *Protestants*, These *Anabaptists* &c. are so various, so opposite in their Tenents, begot, as they think, out of the true *written Word of God*? Is it for want of wit, learning, or languages, They thus Differ? No. Is it for the want of Study and conferring one place of Scripture Clear as they think, with others Obscure? No, Both *Arians*, and *Protestants* have done this long ago. Is it that all these *Sectaries* go against their Conscience, or, wilfully draw Gods Word to a pervers sense He never spake? (let the Innocent cast the first stone at the Guilty) Truly I suspect it in Some, yet cannot judge that All are *Conscious* of so hideous an *Impiety*. *From whence the abuse proceeds.*

The true
reason is
given.

6. The true Reason therefore is. These Sectaries, after the Rejecting of Gods infallible Church, the Oracle of Truth, will, by no more then half an Eye of *Human Reason*, dive into the deep Secrets of Gods Eternal Wisdom *Obscurely revealed* in Scripture (and herein they neither shew Judgement nor Learning :) With this pur-blind Eye of weak Reason They go to work, They steer on their cours, they *judge*, They *Determine*, They *Define*, They *Pronounce* their fallible Sentiments on these High Mysteries, which never the lesse Reason alone is incapable to comprehend, or Master. Hence, They vary as they do. Hence it is, they weary themselves out with opposite frivolous Interpretations of Gods Word (which is but one, whilst they are so divided in their Tenents.) Hence it is, That almost every year we have a new Religion broach'd in England. Such a jumbling we must expect, such endles Dissentions amongst them; And, 'tis a just Judgement of God for their Pride, who truly are no more but poor Schollers, yet Disdain to learn of a good Master, that's willing to teach them all Truth.

Why Secta-
ries vary
as they do.

2. 10.
6. 1. 6. 2. 1.
1. 1.

Endles
Confusion
about the
sense of
Scripture.

7. I call it a *Jumbling*; for, from Scripture (by Reason of its les clear speaking) arise these Dissentions, and though it be quoted a Thousand times, says no more now, Then it did sixteen hundred years ago, And therefore cannot end them, They next fall upon a doubtful conferring one Passage of the Bible with another: Several Versions and Languages are examined, much Adoe they make, And all is to know what God speaks in such Texts, but without fruit; For their Differences are as High as ever, And neither Party gaines or looses the Victory, Since Scrip-
ture

ture alone, nor, the Comparing of Texts together, is able to draw either side, from their *Preconceived* Opinion. After the *Conferring* of places, They are hard at it, with *Fallible* Explications, when behold, express Scripture is cast away by these two Combatants; And now either the One must learn of the Other, what God speaks in Scripture by a *human fallible Explication* (which is *no Scripture*) or nothing is concluded. Who is then to be held the Master Interpreter, the *Arian*, or *Protestant*? Neither. And they have both Reason for it; For, neither ought to yeild in their *own Principles*; The quarrel Therefore goes on, and is endles. If after Their fallible Explications of Scripture they proceed to Inferences: *This follows, That follows &c.* All is plain *Sophistry*, for Scripture Vitiated with a fals Explication, can never Support a true Illation. And upon such unsteady Foundations all Hæresy stand's. *Scripture not understood is the Ground; doubtful Collations of places, fallible Explications, fals Illations are the Superstructure:* They have no more. And thus you se how useless a Book of Scripture is in the hands of an Hæretick, who neither can tell me so much as *Truely*, much les *fallibly*, what God speak's in These High controverted Points of our *Christian Faith*.

Arians and Protestants equally uncertain,

Upon what unsteady Foundations Hæresy stands,

Why Scripture is useless in the hands of an Hæretick

A question proposed, and answered.

Protestants acknowledge a Trinity by Oversight,

8. But you'l ask how then happens it, that *Mr. Poole* and *Protestants* hit right in yeilding an Assent to some *Catholick Verities*; for Example to a *Trinity* of Persons in one Divine Essence, and Contrary to *Arianism* Profess the Son to be *consubstantial* with his *Eternal Father* in one Divine Nature? I answer. They light upon these *Verities* by an *Oversight*, or, as I

Or by
Chance.

Unawares
engaged in
a Belief
They labour in
vain to
find Scrip-
ture for it.

Scſarries
muſt own
the Churches
Inter-
pretation,
or become
Arians.

In doing ſo
They are
neither
Papiffs nor
Proteſtants.

may ſay, meerly by *Chance*. By *Overſight*; For believe it, had *Luter* thought well On't, He might with more eaſe have denyed Theſe High Myſteries of our Faith, then the Real *change of bread* in the Holy Eucharift. By *Chance*: For, as by chance, They Stole a Bible from the old Catholick Church, ſo caſually They took from her, Here and There (as it pleaſed Fancy) ſomewhat of her Ancient *Tradition alſo*. And upon This ground of *Tradition*, or, the infallible Doctrin of the Catholick Church, They Believe (as well as they can) Theſe *Sublime myſteries*. Being thus unawares engaged in a *Belief*, They weary their Heads, and wear out their Bible to find expreſ Scripture for it, (which cannot be found) Becauſe, forſooth, they will Believe nothing upon *Tradition*, or the Churches *infallible Doctrin*. I ſay *Expres Scripture cannot be found*, that Aſſert's Three diſtinct Perſons in one Divine Eſſence, or, the Word to be *Conſubſtantial* with his Eternal Father; Therefore if they Believe theſe *Verities*, They muſt Ground their Faith, not upon *ſole Scripture*, But on Scripture explicated by that never erring *Oracle of Truth* the Catholick Church: Or, on the Word of God *not written*, which we call *Tradition*. You ſe therefore, how our Proteſtants, though in *Actu ſignato*, they ſeemingly Rejeſt *Tradition*, and the Churches Interpretation upon Scripture, yet in *Actu exercito* They own both, and muſt neceſſarily do ſo, or become plain *Arians*. Yet here they are pinch'd again: For, if they Believe theſe Myſteries upon *Tradition*, or on Scripture interpreted by the Church, They are *neither Papiffs, nor Proteſtants*. No Papiffs; for Papiffs hold *Tradition* and the Churches *Interpretation* infallible. No
Pro.

Protestants ; For They profess to Believe no more then God hath expressed in his written Word , Though now they must leave that Hold , and believe upon the Catholick Motive , or renounce the *Faith* of these *Articles*.

9. If *Mr. Poole* pretend expres Scripture for these *High Verities* of Christian Faith , The surest way will be to produce it, without Remitting me to other Authors, or, Adding his fallible Glosses to Gods Word; For, every *Arian* knows well to Distinguish between *express Scripture*, and the superadditions of *Mens Glosses*, fallible Explications, Interpretations &c. Now, if in this particular Mystery of the Trinity, *Mr. Poole* interpret's Scripture *truely*, it is not, God knows, His skill that doth it; No. The Reason is, Because he borrows the Truth from the Churches Interpretation of Scripture, and so fights against an *Arian* with anothers Weapon. Where, by the way observe a strange proceeding of Protestants, who, when They dispute out of Scripture against an *Arian*, They'l have the Churches Interpretation good against him, and His naught against them : And, when they Dispute by Scripture against Catholicks , They will have the Churches Interpretation forceles against themselves, and Their own wretched Glosses powerfully strong against the Church. Were there ever such *Doings* in the world before these dayes ?

When Sectaries interpret Scripture truely They borrow lights from Church Doctrin.
A strange proceeding of Protestants.

10. But we have not yet said all concerning Scripture, Interpretations of Scripture, Inferences out of Scripture &c. Wherefore Becaus we are gone so far , Pardon a further trouble, of giving you a few more Notes on this Subject. They will shew you, if I mistake not,

not, upon what rottering Principles the *Grand Cheat* of Protestant Religion stand's, for want of Infalible Teachers.

C H A P. II.

The Fallacy of Protestants concerning Scripture, and the Interpretation of Scripture, is discovered.

1. **W**E have almost seen enough how Sectaries, either through Malice, Ignorance, or both, make Holy Scripture a Book that proves all Religions, Like *Wittingtons* bells, It ring's out what Fancy will: For in Scripture, is *Arianism*, if we believe the *Arians*: Here is *Protestanism*, if we believe *Protestants*: Here is *Quakerism*, if we believe *Quakers*: Here is what you will, and what you will not; And it must be so, whilst These men have a Bible in their hands, and Construe all as they pleas, Glofs as they pleas, Interpret as they pleas, without Limit or Restraint. It had been much better, Methinks, if such *Sole-Scripturists* had never read Scripture in these *debated* Points of Religion, then after their reading, to se it made a Book that only begets Disfentions; so grossly wronged and abused it is: Yet no Body is in fault: Pure Scripture cryes the *Arian*, pure Scripture saith the *Protestant*, nothing but Scripture saith the *Paritan*, And there is no Redrefs for these Evils. All run on in their wilful misunderstanding
- Scri-

*All Heretics lay
alike claim
to Scripture,
and the
sense of it.*

Scripture, not one of them will yeild to another, nor (which is worst of all, and plain *Perversnes*) Seek after a means (which is yet offered them) to come to a right understanding of it.

2. Truly, I have often wondred at our Protestants, (men, as they say, of a more Sober Temper then your Quakers and Puritans are) How it is possible (after they know right well, with innumerable Holy Fathers, this *Plea*, or pleading *sole* Scripture, to be nothing els but an old Trick of all condemned Hæreticks) That, they can lessen themselves so much (had they no other motive to retard them) as to tread the Footsteps of such unworthy Sectaries, and patronize a Doctrin which cannot but breed Dissentions to the Worlds end. This it is : *Sole Scripture is the Rule of Faith. Sole Scripture speaks plainly in all things necessary to* *Protestants
Plea for
Sole Scri-
pture.* *Their false
Doctrin.*

3. Mr. Poole to mend the matter, having supposed, that *sole* Scripture is the Rule of Faith; withall, That there is enough said in Scripture to end all Controversies, were men humble and Studious &c. Seem's in the 7. Chap. of his *Nullity* page 226. to ground Protestant Religion on these three Positions. The first is. That the *Books of Scripture* are and may be proved to be the Word of God. 2. That in the *Substantials of Faith*, those Books are uncorrupted. 3. That the *Sense of Scripture* may be sufficiently understood in necessary Points. There is no *Arian*, but will most easily admit of these three Pro-
T . . . positions:

positions; How then (were they all True) can they more establish Protestant Religion than *Arianism*? For, a Principle common to two Advers parties cannot (considered *meerly* as a Principle agreed on* by both) more Advantage the cause of One, then the Other. If therefore an *Arian* Assent to these Propositions, they ground no more Protestant Religion, then they do *Arianism*. The Truth is, Mr. Poole is highly wanting in a fourth Proposition, which, if proved, would have done him more service then the other Three.

Mr. Poole
wants a
fourth Pro-
position.

And it should have been to this Sense: *Seeing Scripture speak's plainly all Doctrin necessary to Salvation, Certainly it ought to teach Protestancy plainly*. I mean the particular Tenents of Protestants, as these stand in Opposition to Catholick Doctrin: For if these be necessary to Salvation, Scripture hath delivered them plainly; or if it have not done so, We must Conclude, They are not necessary to Salvation. Thus much premised, we will shew you in the ensuing Discours how slippery and fallacious Protestant Doctrin is, as it Relates to Scripture, and Interpretation of Scripture.

4. The first proposition. *No infallible Church, no Assurance of True and uncorrupt Scripture*. To makes my Assertion good against Protestants, I will only propose this plain Question. From what men of Credit and Integrity, had the first Protestants Their Bible? It was not drop't down from Heaven into their Pulpits, with Assurance of its Purity, or Certainty, that no Change was made in it contrary to Truth since the Apostles Times. Were they *Jewes, Infidels, Turks, Arians*, or *Gracian Heretiks* that gave them Scripture? Too perfidious to be trusted in a matter of such Consequence.

No Infalli-
ble Church
no certain-
ty of true
Scripture.

From
whom had
Protestants
their Bible?

sequence. Too unfaithful either to preserve true Scripture by them, till *Luther* quit his Cell, or, then to put into his hands a Bible *Uncorrupt* in every Point. Were they *Catholicks*? Let our Adversaries shame the Devil, and speak Truth, 'Twas from them They had their Bible, together with *the Originals*. But these Papists, These *very *Catholicks* (if we may credit *Catholicks in Protestants Principles cannot be relied on for Scripture.*) had not only Corrupted the Writings of the Ancient Fathers; But also through Malice, or Ignorance, Had grossly erred a thousand years together, and Changed the Ancient Doctrine of the Primitive Church. They had Secretly wrought into mens hearts a fals Belief of the Churches *Infallibility*, of an *unbloody Sacrifice*, of *Transubstantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, and such like errors. Admit of this Supposition, who is there amongst Protestants, that shall dare to look on his Bible with good Assurance of its Purity, or say, it is the Word of God, and not corrupted by These erring Papists? For, These men who erred in Doctrine, might as well have insinuated errors into the Book of Scripture: They had time enough to do it. These men, who changed the Ancient *Primitive Faith* of Christianity, might as perfidiously have *Altered* the Bible. They wrought secretly a fals Belief into mens hearts concerning an *unbloody Sacrifice*, *Transubstantiation* &c. And why might they not as cunningly have foisted into Scripture *Words* and *Sentences* suitable to such supposed errors? Believe it, it is much easier to corrupt a *dead Book*, then to pervert so many *living Christians*, and bring them to a Belief of so palpable, hideous, and erroneous *Novelties*. *If Papists erred in Doctrine, They might more easily have erred in corrupting Scripture.* *It is easier to corrupt a dead book, then to pervert innumerable living men.*

A Dilemma.

5. Here then is my Dilemma. Either, the Catholick Church had erred when *Luther* and Protestants took the Book of Scripture from it, or was pure in *Doctrin*. If pure, Most wicked were They for deserting it. If the Church had then erred, or was corrupted in *Doctrin*, Neither *Luther*, nor any Protestant can have Assurance, that they read yet True Scripture; For all the Certainty They can have of this Book, is miserably uncertain, and at last Comes to this doubtful Judgements: *It may be we have true scripture: It may be, and more likely, not.* God only knows; All depend's on an Erroneous Church; that gave us scripture, which might as well (in the vast compass of a thousand years) have guilfully changed this our Book from its *Ancient Truth*, as cheated Christianity into a fals Belief.

An unanswerable Argument.

Protestants destroy the very Ground of Certainty.

6. Some may yet say. All now Agree, as well Catholicks as Protestants, upon the Verity and Integrity of Scripture; Therefore its needles (for many Books at least) to *Question* this point farther. I answer. Catholicks agree well, Becaus they take this Book upon the Warrant of *Christs* never erring Church, which cannot Deceive them. But Protestants, who Ruin this Ground of *Infallibility*, destroy with it all Certainty of scripture in order to themselves. Their Agreement therefore is no more but *Verbal*, whilst the Principle which supports a *Real one*, is shaken a pieces by them. Hence you se How *Mr. Poole* speaks at

Catholicks Confession no Proof of the Truth of Scripture to Mr. Poole,

random, when he Tell's us, He knows Scripture to be the Word of God, Becaus Catholicks confels and acknowledge so much. I answer first, Their Testimony *with him* is worth nothing: For They had, before

before he was born, lost all *Credit* by introducing *fals Doctrin* into the Christian World (and why not, say I, as well a fals Bible ?) Such Doctrins He dares not admit of upon the Testimony of Catholicks, yet He will *Kiss their Hands*, and Take from them such a Bible, as They are pleased to give him. 2. The Testimony of Catholicks in this particular, is with him Fallible, and may be Fals; But a Testimony that may be fals, can never give any Assurance of True Scripture, which of necessity must be had, or none can ground Faith upon it. 3. Mr. Poole is piteously out in all he saith; For, he neither *Doth* nor *can* Admit of Scripture upon the Confession or Testimony of Catholicks. Why? Catholicks hold Scripture to be the Word of God, Becaus the *Infallible Church of Christ* Assures them it is Gods Word. This infallible Testimony of the Church Mr. Poole utterly Disown's, and Therefore he must of necessity by his own Principles, Reject the *Catholick Testimony*.

7. Other perhaps will say, That God by Special Providence ever preserved Scripture pure in all *Essentials*, Though He permitted the Church to deceive Souls, and lead them into Error. What an *Antiscriptural* Assertion have we Here? How is God Affronted? What a lame and *half Providence* is granted him? What, no more but only to have care of a Book, to secure That from falshood, and in the *interim* to Permit his own *immaculate Spouse*, his Church (which Scripture should instruct) to play the Harlot, to Deceive the World, and err *Damnably*? O, but what'er becom's of the Church, we must (say our Protestants) have True and incorrupt Scripture, or, no man can

With no colour of reason do Protestants Admit of a Bible upon the Churches Testimony, and reject her Testimony in other matters.

The Church holds her own Testimony infallible, Mr. Poole rejects this, therefore he makes null the Churches Testimony to himself.

So Tories affront God by allowing him no more Than a half Providence.

know what he is to Believe. I answer. And we must either have a True and *incorrupt Church*, or none can be Assured of True and incorrupt Scripture.

It avails little to have Verities shut up in a Bible, if the Church err'd in delivering them to Christians.

Protestants say all Christians err'd for a thousand years.

Say, I beseech you, what doth it avail Christianity, to have the Pure letter of Scripture *clos'd up in a Bible*, and preserved from Error; if Christians Universally had been, as it were Deserted by Almighty God, and permitted (before Protestants appeared in the World) to Err in the very *substantials* of Faith delivered in Scripture? Yet it was so. For confessedly, not only those Antient condemned Hæreticks, as *Arians*,

Pelagians, *Donatists*, and the Later *Gracians*, but also that great *moral body* of Catholicicks (if our Protestants say true) Erred in the very Fundamentals of Faith, Since they Taught, as they do still, their Church to be *Infallible*, an *unbloody sacrifice* &c. Gross errors therefore Reign'd amongst them, whether we suppose the Scripture *Pure*, or *corrupted*.

Imagin then (which is utterly Fals, Though Hæreticks cannot prove it fals) That our Scripture had been corrupted, They had then Erred becaus the Book *was falsified*. Suppose again (which is True) that Scripture is not corrupted, you have still the *same Effect*, which is *Error* in Doctrin drawn out of the *very Words of pure Scripture*.

The Reason surely is, Becaus the Church did not rightly understand Scripture; if so, you se, how Scripture *not understood*, as easily begett's Errors, as if it were corrupted.

Error equally prejudicial whether it be caused by a false Church or falsified Scripture.

What then matters it in Reference to poor beguiled Souls, whether these great supposed Errors arise from Scripture *misunderstood*, or Scripture *corrupted*? Error is Error, and alike Prejudicial in both cases. I say therefore: It is as great an Evil to have a Church (that should

should teach Truth) to deceive the world , in bringing in a Deluge of Errors to the Ruin of the Ancient Primitive Faith, as to have a Bible corrupted. For, 'tis Error, and fals Doctrin wrought in *mens Harts*. That undoes them, Now whether That be caused by a *fals Church*, or *falsified* Scripture, it imports little. Our Protestants Affirm the first, and may justly Fear the second. God (say they) permitted the Church to Err; and he may (say I) as well have permitted it to *Vitiat* Scripture. They say, Errors Insensibly grew up in the Church; And, I say, they might as Insensibly have crept into Scripture. Be it how you will, from this Old erring Church, Our New men suppose, They received *pure, sincere, and uncorrupted* Scripture, just as the Holy Ghost writ it. A meer Impossibility; For, *never greater Chimara was fancied, then to couple a Fals Church and True scripture together*, or, *True Scripture and a Universal fals erring Church*.

What Se-
rmons
ought to
fear.

8. Some perhaps may say: The *Arians, Donatists* and other *Hazreticks*, had and have still True Scripture, though they erred in Doctrin. I answer, No God a mercy to them; For, if They have True Scripture, They may thank an unerring Church that *preserved* it uncorrupt, before Heresy began, and after. But grant me once, as our Protestants do, that both *Hazreticks*, and *Catholicks* likewise *universally* erred in Doctrin *most Fundamental*, no man can now have Assurance of True scripture. O, but the Unanimous Voice of all Christians, Affirming Scripture to be the Word of God, and pure without corruption, is a Weighty moral Proof for its Integrity. I answer none at all: For, if no Society of Christians *unerrable* and

No assu-
rance of
true Scrip-
ture if all
Erred uni-
versally.

and sound in Doctrin had that book in Custody, The old Papists might (for ought Protestants know) have either by *Chance* or *Fraud* changed words in Scripture. For example, *Those words; Matt. 26. This is my body*, from what they once were, *This is a sign of my body*, and the *Cheat* was to maintain their Doctrin of the *Real Presence*. But you will ask how could this be done? I have told you, By *Malice*, or *Inadvertency*.

*Could Sa-
laries say
when Pa-
pists first
became
Idolaters,
They might
be infor-
med con-
cerning
these Cor-
ruptions*

But when could it be done? I answer in that very *Age*, *Year*, or *Month*, when these Papists first began to be Idolaters, and worship a piece of *Bread* for *God*. Then it might well be don. Name that age *Exactly*, and you have all. Our new men Answer, This Idolatry was brought in amongst us; But they knew not *When*; it began with such *Secrecy* and *Silence*. This Text of Scripture therefore, I say, might have been corrupted with *like Secrecy*, Though no man *knows when*. And here by the way observe a stran-

*A Strange
Paradox of
Protestants*

ge Paradox of our Protestants. *So notorious a known Novelty, as this supposed Idolatry is, which might most justly have Struck Terror into all mens Hearts, Visibly entred a Church diffused the whole World over, yet none, neither Friend nor Foe saw it, cryed out against it, or Has left it upon Record.* And one single *Particle* of Scripture cannot be changed, but all must know it. How can these two Consist together? You will say, The Primitive Church was Pure, and so preserved true Scripture. How do our Protestants know so much, if it was *Fal-
sible*? Thus much of an Argument *ad hominem*, which I desire *Mr. Poole* to Answer, not so *mistake*, As he may do, if he think my endeavor is to prove Scriptu-
re corrupted in any Substantial Point (no! Twere Blas-
phemy

phemy to say it.) The Argument therefore proceeds from the Protestants *fals Supposition* (yet true with them) that the Church is *fallible*, and has erred; Then, I say, None of them can have *Assurance* of their Bible, or, of True incorrupt Scripture.

C H A P. III.

*All substantials of Faith are not plain
in Scripture without an infallible
Teacher.*

1. **H**ere is my second Proposition, And nothing can be more evident, might the Evidence of a known Truth prevail with Wilful men. *Arians*, we see, are against *Protestants* in the *Essentials* of Faith, *Protestants* against *Catholicks*, and They against Both. All of them Acknowledge Scripture to be Gods Word, yet every one in practise Denies the Persecuity and Plainness of it: For if plain, Why stand they at Variance with one another about this *Plainness*? *Protestants* Doctrin is plainly delivered in the 39. Articles: The *Arians* Doctrin is plainly in Their Writings: The *Catholick* Doctrin most plainly in every Catechism. No Advers party Impugn's these Doctrins for want of a plain *Expression*, but for want of *Truth*. It is quite contrary in Scripture; for He were a Devil that should mention the want of Truth in Gods Word; yet you see most Learned men vary about this *Clearness*.

*Solitaires
deny the
Plainness of
Scripture.*

seek for it and cannot find it. Though I have partly given the Reason Hereof, yet, Because the matter requires it; I shall now add a word more for a further Explication.

Objective Verities, and the belief of them differ.

2. All know that the *Objective Verities* writ in Holy Scripture, and the *Belief* of those Verities in a Christians Hart, are to be distinguished. By the first God speak's to us. By the second we yeild *Belief* to his Word.

Objective Verities not saving Faith.

All know likewise, That if my *Belief* be true Faith, it must say Exactly, and expres that *in mente*, which God speak's in *Scripture*, neither more nor les. And this is *Saving Faith*, not the *Objective Verity* as it lyes in Scripture; For if that could save us, it would be enough to put a Bible in ones Pocket, And say here is the Faith that *saves me*, Though I know not what is in it, or Believe Amiss. Thus much is clear without Dispute in an *Orthodox*, and an *Arian*; whilst they turn to that passage of Scripture and Read,

I and my Father are one. Both of them have the same *Objective Verity* before their eyes, But the One only hath the True *Belief* of it in his Hart. Observe now, How darkly Scripture speak's in this one great Fundamental Article, And how easily we may swerve from this Revealed Truth, without an Infalible Interpreter:

One Instance of Scriptures Obscurity.

For, the words precisely considered, may either signify *unity in Affection*, as appears *John 17. v. 21. 22.* or a *Consubstantial unity*, and in this Indifferency to several senses lyes their Obscurity. To Clear all, and make them speak a Full sense, the *Arian* superadds his *Gloss*, and draws out of the Text (as also from that other *John 1. 5. 7.*) no more but a *Unity in Affection only*, which is Hæresy. The Catholick Interpretation teacheth a

Scholars Gloss; The Church Interpret.

Con-

Disc. II. C. III. *are not plain in Scripture.* 155

Consubstantial Unity, or *One-nes* in Essence, and *T*is true Faith; yet is no more *formal* *expres* *Scripture*, then that of the *Arian*; For, *Consubstantiality* is no where *Formally* read in *Scripture*: However, it is believed and ground's our Faith, whilst the *Arians* *Gloss* is rejected. And why hath it, this Preference think ye? Why is it better then the *Arians*? No other Reason can be rendered but a most True one, *Viz.* That the Church doth not only fully *Express* the *Object* *Verity* darkly couch'd in *Scripture*, But also Delivers this Full and clearer sense *Infally*: For I say, If the Churches Interpretation were as fallible as the *Arians*, Christians might *indifferently* Adhere to Either, yea, and changeably now take one, then the other as they please. A greater Probability can ballance nothing in this or the like particulars, as I shall largely prove hereafter. In the mean while, by what is now said, we may learn first. Though *Scripture* in this and other *Mysteries* hath its Darknes, yet by the good Providence of Almighty God we are provided of a Sure Interpreter, which is absolutely *Necessary*: For if Every one interpret according to fancy, *Heresy* is easily Drawn out of Gods Word; And if none interpret Faithfully, the *Scripture* still lyes hid in Obscurity, which makes it (for that part) a Useles Book to Christians. Learn farther, That None can ever know exactly by Human Industry, or his Sole pondering the Bible (let him be another *Salomon* for Wisdom) what God hath Revealed in these *difficil* *Mysteries* of our Faith, without an *Infally* Interpreter. To prove my Assertion I'll give you one Instance.

If the Churches Interpretation were as fallible as the Arians, Christians might follow either as they please.

The necessity of an Infally Interpreter.

3. Suppose that two or three most learned Heathen

156 Disc.H.C.III. *All Substantials of Faith*

*An instance of Philo-
sophers
reading the
Bible.*

*If They
ask of none
but Their
own Judge-
ment, or
your fol-
lows.*

*Their
doubts
would be
Endless.*

Philosopher, well versed in Languages, and all Human Literature, had this Book of Scripture put into their Hands, and were perswaded by the *extrinsecal* Authority of all Christians, that God here speaks his *Eternal Verities*: Withall, That if they read the Book, and by their *Sole* reading (without Recours to any Interpreter) possess the True sense of it, They have True *Saving Faith*. Well: They read it, and with as much Humility as any Protestant can do, yet Ask of none, But *their own judgement* what it means, in the more difficult Passages. Tell me, I beseech you, (And here I appeal to the *moderate Judgement* of every Christian, whether Catholick, Arian, or Protestant) What Faith or Religion would these Philosophers produce out of *Sole Scripture*, *Solely* Read, and pondered by them? My Thought is ('Tis no more but a Thought) That the *Result* of their Reading would end in Coyning a Religion different from all Others now in Christendom. I am very confident, They would never pitch upon Protestantcy, no, nor upon any Sect now extant. Alas, they would Doubt and Stagger at every hard passage in Scripture, yea, and by the very *Instinct of Nature* (if they own'd Scripture for Gods Book) would humbly *Supplicate* Those, who gave them the Book, to lay open the Mysteries therein, and Assure them of its *meaning* in a hundred Places; yet none can do this good office for them, But One only Society of Christians that layes claim *so Infallibility*, and proves it Demonstratively, if Faith be in the World.

4. Be it how you will: thus much I conclude. Our Protestants are in the very same Case without

an

an *infallible Interpreter*, as the Philosophers are with *no Interpreter*: These make Scripture speak what *They* think it speaks, right, or wrong, And Protestants do the like, whilst They give their sentiment on Mysteries above their *Reach* without an *Infallible Teacher*. Pray you Reflect.

Had *Christ Iesus*, and his Apostles never Taught any thing by Word of Mouth, But only thrown the Book of Scripture amongst Christians when They left the World, and commanded them to make that use of it, which every *Private Judgement* thought best, what a Religion, think ye, should we have had at this day in Christianity, any or none, or a thousand *different ones* as good as none? God only knows; I do not; Yet will say, This is our very present Condition, if an *infallible Interpreter* of Scripture be Rejected. We may wrangle to the Worlds end, but agree in nothing; Dispute, but conclude nothing; we may raise Difficulties one against another, But allay none. And thus the *contest* must run on, without Redres or Remedy. All

Appellation here to Antiquity, to Councils, Fathers and Tradition help's nothing, Because they are *Fallible*, And were they otherwise, we vary as *highly* about the *Sentiments of Fathers* in every debated point of Controversy, as we do about Scripture *it self*.

5. We se thirdly: How utterly impossible it is for a Protestant to draw, from the *Objective Verities* revealed in Scripture, the True Sense and meaning of Gods Word in any *controversed* point of Religion. The Reason is. Scripture never speak's plainly and expressly the Protestants *Sense* in these debated Controversies, (observe it in All, and you'll find it so.)

Secularies
are in the
very same
case with
out an In-
fallible In-
terpreter.

Strange
Confusions
Had
Christ and
his Apost-
les given to
Christians
a Bible
without an
Interpreter.

Dissensions
would have
followed
without
hope of
union.

Appellation
to Anti-
quity reme-
dies no-
thing being
fallible
with Pro-
testants.

*Selfaries
make Scri-
pture ie
speak what
They would
have it
say, not
what God
speak's*

*Arians
and Pro-
testants
vitiare
Scriptura
after the
same man-
ner.*

*An Exam-
ple.*

What do they therfore to help themselves ? They first Reject an Infallible Interpreter, and next (as the *Arians* do) *superadd* their own Fallible glosses to make Scripture speak, not what it *Truly says*, But what They would have *it say*, And thus they think Scripture cleared, and Their Work don. Take here one Instance for many. Catholicks and Protestants have been at Variance a hundred years and more about these Sacred Words *Matt. 26. This is my Body.* The different Senses drawn from them are *contradictory*, And therfore cannot be True. *This is my Body, Really*, saith the Catholick, and here is my *internal Faith*. No, saith the Protestant : This is my Body, *figuratively*, or a *Sign* of my Body, And this is my Belief. Mark I beseech. Just as the Arian saith : *I and my Father are one*, and superadds his Gloss, of *one in Affection*, so the Protestant here *vitiates* the Text by his Gloss, and adds to Scripture (what God never spoke) a *Trope*, a *Figure*, a *sign*, and I know not what. And after This Injury don to the Words, He Believes not for Gods *Express Word*, But, for his own far-fetcht and dear bought *Interpretations*, which are no more Scripture then if he should tell me, That, That text of *St. Matthew cap. 3. verse 17. This is my beloved Son*, were to be forcibly stript of its Verity, and, *misinterpreted* Thus : This is only a *sign* or *Figure* of my Beloved Son. No more doth Scripture, through the whole Gospel, warrant in the least, an *Impropriety* of speech in the *one Text* now cited, then in the other. I little Regard The Protestant discourses and glosses contrary to *this Mystery* of Faith, (let us have plain Scripture) much les their Inferences, which are

Disc. II. C. III. are not plain in Scripture. 159

are all *Human* and *Fallible*. O, but to say, that *Christ* Body is Really Present under the *Species* of Bread, yea and in a thousand places at Once, is an *Unintelligible* Mystery! Why more Unintelligible then a Trinity of Persons in one Essence, or the unchangeable Divine Word *seemingly* Changed when he took Flesh upon him, and became an Infant? These are Higher Mysteries and greater Difficulties, If Human Reason might be judge, and give a final Sentence. But I'll tell you once for all.

That man shall never be a Proficient in Christs School, that will undertake to conquer, as I may say, the great Difficulties of Faith, by Examining the High Mysteries of it; If he goe so to work, he is cast into a Labyrinth, and can find no Exit. All therfore he is to do, is, to Learn and Examine whether God, the *Infallible Truth*, hath Revealed and taught us these Mysteries by *any unerring Oracle*; Next He is to Captivate his understanding, And humbly Submit to him (without further search) who neither can be Deceived, nor will Deceive us. But enough of this Digression.

High Mysteries no to be tried into by our weak discourses.

How we are to submit in matters of Faith.

6. We se thirdly: Though Protestants Anathematize all that *Add* to Gods Word, or *Take* from it, yet I'll tell you, Their whole Religion (as *Protestancy*) is either *made up* of no Scripture at all, or, is nothing els but a meer Addition of their own Glosses to Scripture, or, finally a wilful Subtraction from it. To the Words now cited, they add a *sign*, a *figure*, and God knows what more. Is this Scripture? When *S. James* 2. cap. 24. Dogmatically teaches, that a man is Justified by *Works* and not by Faith only; our New men tell us, the Apostle speak's not of Justification

The whole Religion of Protestants is nothing els but addition to Scripture, or subtraction from it.

before

before God but before Men. Is this Scripture? When *St. Paul Rom. 2. 6.* plainly Affirm's, That God will render to every one according to his Works. *Calvin* and *Beza* Assure us, He will do so indeed, if there were any *such*, But the Mischief is: None can do a *Good Work* before God. Is this Scripture? No. These, and such like Interpretations Our Adversaries do not own for Scripture, yet They must own them as Tenents *Essential* to their Religion: *Ergo* I say: Meer *Fallible Glosses*, which are no Scripture, make up Protestant Religion as *Protestancy*. And hence it is that their Doctrin delivered in the 39. Articles stand's there with all *Clearnes* (that is, you know what they say) But when 'tis Brought to the *Test*, and is examined by Scripture, you may seek long, before ye find a word like it, as 'tis *Protestancy*.

Doctrin of
the 39 Ar-
ticles as
Protestancy
not scrip-
ture.

7. You see lastly: That the Interpretations which Protestants give to those Texts of Scripture cited by Catholicks (for their Doctrin) are meer Human *Extra-scriptural* and *Anti-scriptural* Glosses of their own Fancy. We cite the Apostle 2. *Thess.* 2. 15. For Tradition beside the Written Word: For the Real Presence, *This is my Body Matt. 26.* For *Iustification* by Good Works, that of *St. James 2. 14.* For a *Sacrifice* to be continued to the Worlds End, *Malac. 1. 11.* For *Ex-tream-Vnction*, *James* the 5. 14. For the Verity and *Infallibility* of the Church, that of *St. Paul 1. Timot. 3. 15.* And what, for Gods sake, have we from our New Men to these plain Passages *speaking Popery*, But a *Return* of meer Mock-fool Glosses, Hatch't in their own Heads, which have so little Shadow of Scripture in them, That with force they drive the very *life and sense*

How Secta-
ries abuse
Scripture
cited for
Catholick
Doctrin.

ense out of Gods Word? And They proceed so unluckily, That where Scripture is clear, They make it obscure, and where it is obscure, They will seem to make it Clear by superadded glosses. What can be more clear for our Catholick Doctrin of the Real Presence then those words of *St. Luke 22. v. 19. Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis datur : This is my body which is given for you?* Yet with their Glosses they so Torture the Text, That every Particle in it suffers Violence. In so much that *Iacobus Gordonus* observes, in his first Tome of Controversies, printed anno 1612. *Controversia prima de Verbo Dei cap. 26. n. 11. pag. 121.* No fewer then two hundred different Glosses, have been added by Protestants to Obscure the plain sense of *Christs* own Words. Some, as this Author notes, abuse and misinterpret the Pronoun *Hoc*, Others the Verbe *Est*, Others *Corpus*, Others *meum*, Others the Relative *quod*, Others the Proposition *pro*, Others the Pronounce, *Vobis*, Others finally the Verb *Datur*. Yet after all this perverting and woful mangling of Gods Word, we must Believe that our Protestants speak (forsooth) Scripture, and nothing but clear Scripture. On the contrary side, we have seen more then enough in the Beginning of this Chapter, how Vainly They cry up the Clarity of Scripture in Mysteries most difficult, not fully expressed in Gods Word. What man in his Wits can say, That any Scripture through the whole Testament Speaks half so clearly of the *Consubstantiality* of the Eternal Son with his Eternal Father, as the Text now quoted is for the Real Presence? Yet those Scriptures must be Clear, for that Christian Verity, and this Obscure, for the Real Presence.

Sectaries make Scripture clear where 'tis obscure, and obscure where 'tis clear.

Scripture tortured by Sectaries.

*Now to proceed with
Sectaries
when They
Explicate
Scripture.*

8. To conclude this point, Methinks it highly imports, when we deal with our Adversaries concerning Their Explications of Scripture, That we do not so much (at least in the first place) make it our Work Positively to *Disprove* them by other Texts, and Authorities (which our Writers usually do, and laudably) as to put them to the *Proof* of their *wild Glosses*, which seem's most Reasonable: For *Asserenti incumbit probatio*. When therefore They go about to *Obscure* Scripture where it is plain, with new Interpretations (the world never heard of) bid them not only *Interpret*, but *Prove* Their Interpretations: For example, That the words of our Saviour now cited must be alienated from their *genuin Sense*, and tortured as they are by Protestants. Proceed thus with them, put them to the Proof, and you'll soon see them at a *Nonplus*.

C H A P. IV.

Sole Scripture without an infallible Interpreter can be no Rule of Faith.

*Protestants have no Scripture
for their Religion, as it is
Protestancy.*

i. **M**Y first proposition Draw's Proof enough from the precedent Chapter; For if Scripture be
Obscure,

Disc. II. C. IV. *no Rule of Faith.* 163

Obscure, and speak not clearly all Verities revealed in the book, it cannot *Regulate* Faith without an *Interpreter*. But 'tis more then evident, that it speaks not *clearly* many Verities Concerning the Highest Mysteries of Religion; Therefore it cannot *Regulate* Faith relating to These Mysteries, without an *Interpreter*. I prove the *Minor*. Scripture which solely considered according to the *Exterior Letter*, both *may*, *The bare letter of Scriptura may and doth easily beget error:* and *Doth*, as easily beget *Error* as *Truth* in the Intellectual Power of man, Speak's not clearly. (Whence it is that *St. Austin* Tom. 10. *Serm. 70. de Tempore*, Stiles *Hæreticks Infelices*, Unhappy, Who only look on the Sound of words in Scripture, which is, saith he, like a *Body* without a *Soul*.) But it is as clear, That the bare Letter of Scripture (without a sure Interpreter) beget's Errors, And therefore an *Arian* Because He Regulates his Belief by the meer *Sound* of that Text *John 14. My Father is greater then I*, Err's damnably. And the like All other condemned *Hæreticks* have done in their respective Errors, drawn as they thought, from Scripture. *Ergo* it is evident, that the Letter of Scripture speak's not Clearly in this one most High Mystery, And therefore cannot *Regulate* Faith, without an Interpreter. Now further. *If this Interpreter be fallible, He is as Useles to Christians for the Regulating of Faith, as if he were no Interpreter, For He may Deceive them, And if we be deceived, it much imports not, whether the Error proceed from Obscure Scripture misunderstood, or misinterpreted by an other. An infallible Interpreter therefore is necessary in this Weighty matter, that Assures us of what God hath spoken, of such and such Particular* *A fallible Interpreter as useles as no Interpreter in points of Faith.*

cular Mysteries. *And here we Rest securely, and have a most certain Rule which Sectaries want.*

2. Again I argue. If Sole Scripture be a clear Rule of Faith, it can *Regulate* without Glosses, yea, and without a Preacher too. Why therefore do our Protestants charge that one Text above cited, *This is my body* (the like we may say of many others) with so unnecessary a burden of their Interpretations? Are They afraid that *Christ* spoke too Plainly, and therefore Add their Glosses to Obscure his Words? None will own such an Impiety. Then I say: They are Added to 'Clear an *Obscure Passage*, consequently, They must acknowledge an Obscurity in this Scripture, before their tampering with the Text, and glossing it. Well. But when They have glossed all they can, I

Are Sectaries afraid that Christ spoke too plainly?

They gloss to make Scripture clear.

Their glosses regulate their Faith, not the Words of Christ.

ask what is it that *Regulates* their Faith in this particular? Do *Christ's* Words as he spoke them, or, as They interpret, *Regulate* here? Not the first: For 't is most evident, that *Christ's* own Words without the Protestant Glosses, can never beget in any Understanding that *determinate* Belief, which these men have of the Blessed Sacrament; For, the words of *Christ* say plainly, *This is my Body that is given for you*; Which pondered to the day of Judgement, can never yeild this forced, repugnant, and *far-fetch'd* Sense, *This is a sign*, or a *Figure* of my Body. Yet such is the Belief of Protestants drawn from this Sentence, by their Interpretations.

Wherefore, we must conclude that They Believe not for *Christ's* Sole Words, But for their *Additional Glosses*, which is to say in plain English, *Their Overplus of Glosses Regulates Faith, not Gods Express and most significant Word.* Some will say this Passage

now

now cited, must be interpreted as They will have it, Because Scripture in other places seem's to favor their Interpretation. I answer candidly. Let them but produce so much as one plain Text out of the whole Bible, for the Alienating of this Sentence from its proper Sense, without Glosses (which are no Scripture) and I'll proclaim them Conquerors. Here is plain dealing, but Remember well, *I call for Scripture only.*

They cannot cite one Text out of Scripture in favour of their Glosses.

3. I told you just now, That as these Glosses are useless, if sole Scripture be a clear Rule of Faith, so are Preachers also, yea and all the large Commentaries which *Luther* and *Calvin* have writ on Scripture. Why? Gods Word speak's clearly without a Preacher: *Away* therefore with Preaching, and Commentaries. 'T is enough to thrust a Bible into mens Hands, And bid them read it, *For there is True Doctrine, and plain Doctrine, but more is not required to Regulate Faith, then Truth and Clarity; Ergo,* Ministers may hereafter well spare their labor of Preaching, and 'tis better they did so, Then to be in danger of perverting Gods true Word, by their fallible Talking.

If Scripture be Clear, ther's no need of Teachers.

The Reason.

4. To conclude this matter, we have already amply proved, That it is not the Bare Letter of Scripture which Regulates Faith, But the exact and true Sense of it (*Ne putemus, saith St. Hierom in cap. 1. ad Galat. 2. 11.* Let us not think, that the Gospel lyes in the Words of Scripture, but in *their sense. Non in superficie, sed in medulla,* not in the Out-side, but in the inward Pith and Marrow of it, *non in sermonum foliis &c.*) But, no Protestant, with so much as any colour of Reason, can lay a more just claim to the true Sense

*Protestants
as uncer-
tain of the
true Sense
of Scriptu-
re, as
Arians
are.*

*All of
them gui-
ded by
guesses.*

*Three parts
of Prote-
stant Reli-
gion.*

*The want
of Mr. Poo-
le's fourth
Proposition.*

*Three Pro-
testant Af-
firmations for
Mr. Poole
to Prove.*

of Scripture, when He and the Church stand at Variance, Then an *Arian*, a *Pelagian*, or a *Donatist* can do, when They draw Scripture to Their Sense. All of them are alike, guided by meer *Guesses*, and first *Read*, next *Think*, then *Judge*, and lastly *Believe*. Believe what? What Their Private Iudgement Tell's them, and here is the last Rule of their Faith, wherof more in the next Chapter. In the interim, you may Resolve a Protestants Belief into these three broken Shreds, or Fragments. The first part is that, wherein They hold with Catholicks: And here they have the true Sense of scripture interpreted, yet no True Faith, for want of Submission in other Points. The other part is that, wherein They agree with Ancient condemned Haresicks: And herein, They have neither the True sense of Scripture, nor true Faith. The last part is proper to Themselves as Protestants; And here they have not so much as the Letter, or a Word of Scripture for them: much les any true Sense, or Faith grounded on Scripture. And

5. Upon this occasion I come to mind *Mr. Poole*, of the Want of his fourth Proposition, viz. That Scripture speak's plainly the particular Tenents of Protestant Religion, as Protestantism. And must Tell him: He shall never find in the whole Bible, so much as one Article of Protestant Religion (as it stands in Opposition to Catholick Doctrin) grounded on Scripture. And, Becaus The man may not perhaps like of too great a burden, I'll only urge him to Prove these three Protestant Affertions.

1. That there are two Sacraments and no more; But let him not think to turn me of, as he doth the Captain, with meer empty and insignificant Words, Appendix page 34. Scripture is plain enough

enough in describing the nature of two Sacraments. He should have added; And 'tis plain in describing the number also, and given good Scripture for both, which cannot be don. 2. *That Faith only Justifies.* 3. That, after he hath better pondered the Text of *St. Peter* 2. 3. 16. He prove by Scripture, the *Plainness of it in all necessary Points to Salvation.* A fourth proof, concerning the Canon and Certainty of Scripture, would choak *Mr. Poole*: But I'll not give him so undigestible a pill, may He pleas. to satisfy the three former Demands by Scripture *only*, without Glosses and ungrounded Inferences drawn from what he thinks to be Gods Word, *But is not.*

6. Some perhaps may ask why all this time, whilst we have Discours'd of Scripture, of its *certainty*, of its Sense, and Regulating Faith &c. None of *Mr. Pooles* Arguments against us are taken notice of? Hath he none, or do I Dissemble them? I answer. The man hath nothing like an Objection. To prove Scripture to be the Word of God, He Relyes on the Confession and Testimony of Catholicks. This we have Refuted above. To prove it *uncorrupt* in the Essentials of Faith, He Tell's us, that by looking into the *Nature and quality* of those *Various Lectiōs*, which are pleaded as Evidences of Corruption, we shall quickly find them to be in Matters of les Moment. It seem's They are little, Becaus *Mr. Poole* without Proof will have them so. I could shew him great ones in the Protestant Bible, But let them pas, And be pleas'd to note how poorly he shifts of the Difficulty That Presses. The Difficulty is concerning the best Originals, which Protestants have hitherto

*Mr. Poole
hath no-
thing like
Argu-
ments.*

ther to met with (none of them I believe ever yet saw the *Autograph*, or Hand-writing of either an Euangelist or Apostle) These *Originals*, I say, cannot be proved Uncorrupt, if that Church which had them in Custody for a thousand years, brought in a Deluge of Errors into the Christian World. Finally to prove, that a Protestant hath a Sufficient Assurance of Understanding the Sense of Scripture in things Necessary to Saluation, He allegeth Gods Promise, *John 7. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the Doctrin whesher it be of God :* But Protestants do Gods will, (thus much must be added, or the Proof stands on one Leg) and *Papist Do not Gods will ; Ergo Those have Assurance of the true Sense of Scripture, and These have not.* Here is the doughty Argument, and that which follows is as weightles. Protestants, saith He, have the Assurance of Reason (Papists have no more) and if that will not do, They have the Assurance of the Spirit which God promiseth *Luk 11.* Here is work enough for another Chapter : Yet in passing I cannot but reflect on a mittaken quotation in *Mr. Poole* page 230. where he cites *sixtus senensis*, And both err's in the Annotation and Doctrin of *Sixtus*, concerning the Clarity of Scripture. *Sixtus* Therefore libro 6. *Annotat.* 152. (not 151. as *Mr. Poole* Quotes, s. *Quod autem*, Answering an Objection of *S. Chrysostom*, plainly Afferts, that when Scripture is said to be clear, 'tis not to be referred to the Whole Bible, but to a Part of it only, wherfore, saith He *S. Chrysostom* divides Scripture into two Classes ; The One contains the hidden and abstruse Mysteries of Gods deep Wisdom, And this part is not clear at all (thus

Mr. Poole
misquotes
Sixtus Sc-
nenfis,

(thus much Mr. Poole conceals.) *Altera sectio.* The other section, or Part of it, compriseth the First and chiefest Principles of all things to be Believed, and Chief Precepts of living; *And so much is clear.* Observe well. The first and *Chiefest Principles* of things to be Believed, infer no Clarity in every Particular revealed Mystery: For He that believes this one Principle of Faith, *That the Church is Holy and the Pillar of Truth*, Hath a *First great Principle*, and may learn by it *all Truth*. If you please to see how Mr. Poole abuseth *Sixtus*, read him in the page now cited. It were most easy to Take him tripping in other Citations, But that is not my task at present. This only came in by Chance.

C H A P. V.

*The Reason of private men, and their
private Spirit, cannot interpret
Scripture.*

1. **M**^{R.} Poole told us above, That Protestants have the Assurance of Reason for the Sense of Scripture. Happy They, if they were the only Reasonable men in the World. But why are not Papists as Reasonable? Why should the *Pelagians*, the *Arians*, or Honest *Quakers* be left out of the list of Rational men? Or, if These would Monopolize the Assurance of Reason to Themselves for their Sense of

Y

Scriptu-

Were Reason
allowed
of to sen-
tence the
Sense of
Scripture,
we must
know who-
se reason
hitt's
right.

All do not
Interpret
Scripture
truly.

Whose Reason
must
yeild, and
to whom
whilst we
vary about
the sense?

Scripture, Why are They not to be Credited upon their *Parole*, as well as Protestants? For their proof is to say, They have it (*crede quod habes & habes*) and so will an *Arian* or *Quaker* say too. Admit therefore (which is fals) that Reason be allowed of as Judge, or an Instrument to sentence the Sense of Scripture, where it speaks obscurely. We are nothing Advanced, nor one whit the Wiser, unless we know *whose Reason* it is, that hitt's right on the Sense. Now, all of them, most evidently do not so (unless we impiously say, that God hath revealed *Contradictions* in Scripture) Because these mens Reason draws contradictory Senses out of Scripture, and in High Points of Faith also. Say then, good *Mr. Poole*, whose Reason must yeild, and to whom? Must an *Arians* submit to yours, or yours to an *Arian*? Must mine bend to yours, or yours to Mine? Or may we all hold on to the day of Doom; as Devided in *Faith*, as we are in *Indgements* concerning the *Sense* of Scripture? Allow once of these Endles and Eternal jarrs in *Religion* here on Earth (which this one Principle of Following private Reason establisheth) and you may seek for another Heaven then *Christ* hath promised to the Children of Peace Hereafter, That is, for none at all. God forgive these late Tumultuous Spirits, the True cause of our wofull Dissentions. But let us go on. And

2. Pray you tell me, when Protestants say They have the Assurance of Reason for the Sense of Scripture in controverted Points of Faith, E. G. *The Trinity*; what signifies this word *Reason* with them? Doth it import a *Formal Discours*, much of that nature as Schoolmen

men use, when they establish their Tenents in Divinity? If so; the *Principle* of this Discours must be admitted of, and own'd by the two Advers parties, when by Reason only They plead for the True sense of Scripture, And the Conclusion of the Discours must be drawn from *Premises* founded on This *received Principle*. Thus much supposed, I might here ask first: Upon what known and admitted *Principle* Do our Protestants ground a lawful Syllogism, whereby They prove, That *Their* Reason hath ever the good luck, the singular Priviledge to fall right on the True sense, whilst Others as learned as They swerve from it? If here They talk of the *Vnction* teaching Truth, of the *spirit* &c. They will be urged again for a *Principle* to prove, That these Favors singularly belong to Them, and not to Others who Dissent from them. But we will wave this Argument, And only note, how in all those Disputes which our Protestants hold either with Catholicks or Sectaries (take for an Instance the *Arians*) the True sense of Scripture is so far of from being a *received Principle* by both these Litigious Parties, That it is ever the *Thing in Question*, and must be proved by another own'd and *admitted Principle*, if the Discours stand upon solid ground.

3. One example will give you more Light. *Mr. Poole* Assaults an *Arian* (a far weaker Adversary then a Catholick) with a Scriptural Proof, for that, High Mystery of our Faith, the *Sacred Trinity*, and argues thus. Scripture saith *John 1. c. 5. 7. There are Three, that bear record in Heaven, the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, and these three are one*; But the *Sense* of this Scripture, saith *Mr. Poole*, is, That God is one in Essence,

Sectaries are to say what this word Reason signifies.

If a formal Discours, two Advers parties must agree on a Principle.

No Principle to prove that Protestants reason with rights.

The sense of Scripture when two Sectaries dispute is ever the thing in Question.

'Tis proved by an Instance.

and Three *Distinct Persons*: The Father *Unproduced*, the Son *Produced*, and the Holy Ghost *Proceeding* from Both. Ergo we must admit a Trinity. Observe well. The *Arian* Admit's the first Proposition, or the Words, of Scripture, *And here is the only Principle agreed on by these two Disputants*; But utterly denyes the second, *Viz. The Sense drawn out of these Words*, And tell's his Adversary, that *this Sense* is the very *Thing in question*; but no received Principle, And therefore must be proved, not supposed against him: *Proved I say*, and by *Sole Scripture*, which yet cannot be done, Though we turn to all the Texts in the Bible. Most justly therefore may the *Arian* tell *Mr. Poole*: If his Faith fall upon such a *Determinate Sense* now given, He Believes it, either Becaus His private Judgement molds Scripture to that *Meaning*, or, Becaus He takes it upon the *Authority* of a Church, which he professedly Disowns, and will not *Believe*.

*The Arian
admits of
the words
of Scripture,
but denies
Mr. Poole's
sense.*

4. In reference to what is here said, note first. That as the True sense of Scripture is supposed, and not proved against an *Arian* by force of Scripture in this particular Mystery, so much more, it is ever supposed and not proved, when Protestants dispute against Catholicks. The reason is. Their private Judgement first makes what sense they please (which is no received Principle) and afterward They vapor like *Conquerors*, as if *Sole Scripture* did the deed, and defeated us. Upon the great Assurance I have of This my Assertion, I challenge *Mr. Poole* (or any Protestant) to produce one Text against the Roman Catholick Faith, which, without the *Mixture* of Their private Judgements, or unadmitted Glosses, speak's
so

*Protestants
first frame
a them'sel.
ves a Sense
of Scriptu-
re, and then
triumph.*

*They have
not one
Text of
Scripture
against the*

so much as *Probably* against it. The more plausible place, they insist on, is That of *St. Iohn cap. 6. vñ-les you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood &c.* For communion under both kinds, which nevertheless must have twenty Glosses, and as many *self Indgements* upon it, before it can put on a likelyhood of a proof against us.

Roman Catholic Faith without the mixture of Their private Indgements.

5. Note 2. That whilst the Sense of Scripture lyes under dispute, and is not agreed on by the two Parties at Difference, For example a Catholick and Protestant, It is but Labour lost in the *Protestant*, to Assault his Adversary with Texts of Scripture: For, the Catholick Answers, *Olim possideo prior possideo*, I have ever believed the sense of Gods Word to be such as you know we *Catholicks own*, And can you my *Antagonist*, perswade your self to drive me out of the *Possession* of my Ancient Belief, by your Sole private Judgement, or, Those new Glosses you father on *Scripture*? If so: A worthy Gentleman, who by right of his Ancestors for a thousand years and upward now quietly possesseth his lands, May be turn'd out of House and Harbor, upon the *private* Judgement of some New upstart Fellow, That Tell's him, He verily thinks the Ancient Writings for his Lands, are not wel Understood; Therefore he will first do him the favor to explicate them according to his *private Opinion* (though contrary to the Sense hitherto received) which done, he will drive him out a doors, and make him a Beggar. This is our very Case.

Why Protestants loose labour when They argue by Scripture.

What the Catholick answer's.

6. Contrarywise, when the Sense of Scripture is agreed on, we may Argue as *Schoolmen* do, and draw from it *Theological Conclusions*; which though often Va-

How we may argue from Scripture.

174 Disc. II. C. V. *The private Spirit or Iudgement*
 rious amongst Divines, yet the Principle admitted
 (I mean the Sense of Scripture) remain's unquestion-
 ed, and is maintain'd without Contradiction. With-
 out Such an *agreed on sense*, which either Scripture (as
 it often doth) Deliver's plainly enough, or, The com-
 mon consent of Learned men makes Highly proba-
 ble, or, The Church of *Christ* declares certain. 'Tis
 to no more purpose to Dispute out of Scripture, then to
 speak *Arabick* to an Illiterate Peasant. Yet, the loose
 Behavior of our Protestants is such, that it lead's them
 (without the guidance of these Lights) first to *Fancy*
 a Sense of their own, and then draw strange *Conclu-*
sions from it. So *Mr Poole*. After he had by his own
 Interpretation, perverted that Text of *St. Paul*, *The*
Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth; might wel say,
 The Church is not proved Infallible. Thus much
 is noted, if the word *Reason* signify a formal Dis-
 COURS.

*The Fancy
 of Sectaries*

*Another
 Acception
 of the word
 Reason, re-
 fused.*

7. Perhaps Protestants may reply (For in Truth it
 is the hardest thing in the world where to have them
 in their Answers) That *Reason* here imports not any
 Discours at all, But an immediate *clear Light Transfu-*
sed into their Mind, when they read Scripture (like
 a Beam shot from the Sun) wherby their Eyes as
 perspicuously discern the most Abstruse *Sense* in it, as
 men do the Sun by its Light, or the first known Prin-
 ciples of nature by Their own Indisputable Evidences.
 Is this Reply think you rational, that draws not so
 much as a Dram of Reason after it? For, if their
 new Faith hath set new Eyes in their head, It hath
 not, surely, pluck't out their Neighbours Eyes, who
 yet, I hope, may see what is *discernable* by All. None
 then

then ever questioned the Sun-shining at Noon-day, or Writ Commentaries on the first natural Principles; Yet we se These new Sectaries not only highly at Variance about the Sense of Scripture; but alio Gods Church (which hath Eyes as well as They) as highly-opposite opposite to them. However, the Church must be Counted Pur-blind, and They only sharp-sighted, though the Light they fancy may licence any Hæretick to say what he pleases: For, as They Set up their Light, so an *Arian* may set up his against it, And swear 'tis the Clearer of the two for his sense. And who can gainsay him?

8. From this Discours it follows, that the Assurance of *Reason*, wherof our Protestants talk so much, is a most *insipid Word*; For it doe's not signify a Formal Discours for want of a known and received Principle, Nor, That quicker immediate Light (of all Fooleries the worst) now refuted. I'll go farther, and say, That no Christian by the force of *Reason* only, when he reads These difficil Mysteries in Scripture, can so much as once fasten a prudent certain Iudgement, either upon the *Thing* revealed, or the *Ratio credendi*. Not upon the *Thing* revealed, For that Transcends the Capacity of *Reason*; nor upon the *Motive*, why he Believes, For by the force of *Reason* only, he cannot know exactly (Guess he may and miss) that God speak's expresly in such a sense. Therefore, if upon his own Halt-sighted and too daring Conceit, He will proceed to a settled Iudgement, and say positively what God speak's, "He tells the Story before he knows it, And consequently highly offends against *Reason*: For Reason dictates, that we must first Learn, Before we undertake to Teach, or, rashly enter into the

Light set
up against
Light.

No Christian by
Reason only can dive
into the
Mysteries
of Scripture.

176 Disc. II. C. V. *A private Spirit or Iudgement*

the deep Secrets of Gods Divine Wisdom, without a certain and infallible Doctor.

9. Therefore before we come to the Assent of Divine Faith, A master, an infallible Proponent is necessary, who without *Ambiguity* assures us that God Speak's, and in such a *determinate Sense*. This once admitted, Reason hath no place at all in the very *Elicite Act of Faith*, or, if it enter, it *spoiles Faith*, as I shall presently declare.

The Different Operation of Reason in a Catholic, and in a Protestant.

10. I'll therefore Explicate my self further, and withall shew how Reason goes to Work in a Protestant, And how differently it Proceeds in Catholics. The Protestant hath no more but the bare Letter of a Bible before his eyes, And toyls hard with that one weak *Instrument*, his own Reason, to find out Gods Sense Therin. He *Read's*, he *Humm's*, He *Pans'ses*, He *Expound's*, He *interpret's*, and afterward, Believes what he thinks is True. Marck well. He *knows what He Thinks*, but yet *knows not*, upon any Rational Inducement, or, *solid Motive Extrinsiccal* to his Thought, that God speaks as He Thinks. Question him in any Particular, and you will find, what I say, most True. For example. Why, when He reads Those Words, *This is my Body*, he believes Christs Sense to be: *This is a Sign or Figure of my Body*. Ask him where is the Rational Inducement that lead's him to own this sense? If Rational, He is able to give an Account of it to others? If herein he show himself *unaccountable*, He doth not only expose his Belief to the contempt of *Unbelievers*, but to Those thousands of believing Christians that oppose it. Nevertheless 'Tis so. For he can render no other Reason for this new

Sectaries know what they think, but know not why They believe.

The proof is given.

new coyned Sense, But that after the reading of Scripture, pondering the Words, examining the Difficulties, and conferring places together, He is wrought into a Perswasion, That God Speak's *just as he Thinks*, and no otherwise; where you first se, That all the Reason he hath, walk's, round in the compass of his own *weak Head*, without Shewing so much as a Resemblance of any sutable Evidence of it to others, who notwithstanding know Reason as well as He. You se secondly, That such a man Acts more the Part of a Pope, then ever any did that Sate in *Peters Chair*; For he positively Defines what Scripture saith, without the Extrinsicall Help either of Ancient Tradition, or the Continued Sense of the Church. Never Pope defined so at *Random*.

II. And upon this Occasion I say more. When the very best of Fathers, whether a *St. Austin*, a *St. Hierom* (or who you will) differently (as it often happens) expound and Interpret Scripture by their Private Judgement, grounded upon *Vnevidenced Principles*, or upon meer conjectural *Probabilities*; Their private *Sentiments* can Advance us no further, But to an Opinion only (which therefore I may, without offence, Reject) and never bring us to a settled *Act* of Faith. Yet, a far more *Vnevidenced* private Judgement in a Protestant doth all, And (as the only Light he see's by) serves him both to apprehend that God Speak's, and in what Sense he Speaks. Upon so great a want of Evidence his whole Faith depends. Hence we se thirdly. If Faith be a discursive *Act*, as some of our New men hold, That is, an *Act* founded on a Rational *objective Inducement*, which inclines the

The Reason of Sectarines laid forth.

How They proceed.

Of the sentiments of Fathers expounding Scripture.

No Protestants can say why he Believes as he doth.

He only returns you the subjective Light of his own Judgement for Answer.

Mind to Judge as they do, and Believe as They Judge, it is impossible for any Protestant to Answer the question why he believes (that God speak's and in such a Sense) by the Strength and Light of his own Judgements: Forstead of the Rational Objective Inducement, which ought to incline him, and we inquire after; He returns only the Subjective Light of his own Internal Judgement, which being only a fallible Act, Clear's nothing without some kind of further Evidence, nor Answers the Question, why he Believes? Unless this be the WHY, That, because he thinks his own Thought true, He is pleased to believe as he think's. Where you find the reason most unreasonable, Because it is Unresolvable into either Rational Motive, or any known and received Principle.

The private Spirit supposeth, but proposeth no new Motive of Faith.

Protestants say it.

Protestants cannot prove that the Operation of Grace is their peculiar Inheritance.

12. We see 4. Though we Allow to Protestants as much of the private Spirit as their Harts can wish for, wherby They are, as it were, pushed on to Judge and Believe: Yet this Spirit being only (As They say) The Operation of Grace, chiefly fortifies the Power that Believes; But proposeth no new, or further Rational Motive of Belief: For it must suppose the total motive, Antecedently proposed, discernable by more then one only, Before it can either push, or work to any purpose. And this is what some Protestants Assert, Viz. That the Operation of the Spirit is more by way of Efficiency, (ex parte subjecti credentis) in order to the begetting Faith, then suppletory of the Rational Inducement, That objectively moves, and draws men to Believe. Be it how you will (though indeed our Protestants have an odd Spirit) They cannot shew probably, That the Operation of Gods Divine Grace is more their peculiar Inheritance, then others, who Believe contrary to them. . . But of

Disc. II. C. V. *no Interpreter of Scripture.* 179
of this hereafter. In the *Interim* note, That in the
Discours hitherto, we inquire not so much after the
Reason of Protestants for the Canon of Scripture, as
for its *Sense* in Points of Controversy. Whereof you
will see more in the next Chapter.

C H A P. VI.

*The new mode of Protestants Misinter-
preting Scripture, which proves the
Churches Infallibility, is more
Amplly Refuted.*

1. **W**E noted above, That it much Avail's,
when Sectarics take a liberty of glossing
Scripture as they please; to urge them to a Proof of
their Interpretations. By this close Dealing, we
shall learn much of their *Fallacious Spirit*, and see, How
they both abuse their Readers, and (which is worse)
the Sacred Word of God.

2. In the former Discours we Handled that Con-
troversy concerning the Infallibility of Pastors and
Teachers in the Catholick Church. To prove the
Verity, we allege such *Express Scripture*, That I dare
affirm, the whole Bible speak's no where any Truth
of our Christian Faith then This, in more plain, Cata-
gorical and *significant* Terms, Might The words without
patches of vain glosses, have their *open* and *obvious* Sense.

*Scripture
most signi-
ficant for
Infallible
Teachers.*

3. For the infallibility then of Living Teachers we cite what *Christ* said, *Luk. 10. 16. He that Hears you, hears me, &c.* (or, as the Greek read's, and perhaps more significantly, *Hearing you, he Hears me*) and Argue thus. *He who hears Christ speak, Hear's a Teacher subjectively Infallible in Doctrin and Teaching, But He who Hear's those, who are pointed at by that particule, You, Hear's Christ speak (for hearing you, he hears me:) Ergo, he Hear's Teachers subjectively Infallible, in their Doctrin and Teaching.*

*Arguments
for Infalli-
ble Teach-
ers.*

*The gloss
of Sectaries*

4. To this a *Grandy* amongst our Sectaries Answer's. That Saying of *Christ, He that hears you &c. was Absolutely true in the Apostles, who kept themselves to that which was revealed by Christ; But it was only conditionally true (mark the Gloss) in their Successors id est, So long and so far, as you speak my words, and not your own.* Observe, I say, the injury done the Text by a *Self-conceited Glosser*, And he speak's peremptorily (*it was but conditionally true in their Successors*) Who saith so Good Sr? *Christ?* Or you? Prove your Gloss, which *Overreaches* the Text, and All the Words which God ever spoke. Must I therefore be fooled into a fals Belief, And hold all the Pastors in *Christ's Church* Fallible, Becaus you a meer fallible *Man*, are pleased to tell me They were fallible, or, that All they had was only the *Small allowance* of a *Conditional*, but of no *Absolute Infallibility?* Evangelical Sincerity requires a proof of an Assertion so newly coyned. Produce it then and let it be plain Scripture. Unless this be done, Any New Hæretick may give the quite contrary Gloss to *Christ's Words*, And say, *That the Apostles were only conditionally infallible, whilst living with Christ, They might be rightly instructed, in case they erred; But that*

*How despe-
rately falli-
ble men go
about to
perswade
that all
Pastors are
fallible.*

*A new Se-
ctary may
say that the
Apostles
were only
condition-
ally infalli-
ble, but*

the

Disc. II. C. VI. Protestants interpreting Scripture. 181

the following Pastors of the Church were made Absolutely Infallible, Because they had not the Personal Presence of so good a Master to reclaim them, in case they swerved from his Doctrine. Thus much is said, and only said without

Their Successors absolutely infallible.

Proof; And your Gloss, good Sr, hath no better Proof to enhance it, But your own saying, which is not worth a rush. O, But they are strange kind of Sectaries, say you, who deny the Apostles Infallibility. They are so indeed. And as strange They are, who deny to the true Church Infallible Teachers. But this is not what I aim at. All I now say, is, That, if

such Sectaries appear (perhaps amongst you in England) They prove Their Assertion as well by venting their

Fancies vented without proof by both these Sectaries.

Glosses upon Christs Words, as you do yours. You say, Those words were only conditionally True in the Apostles Successors, But prove nothing. They say, The Words were conditionall in the Apostles Themselves, But absolute in their Successors, And prove nothing.

You are here both alike, unless Luthers proof help you out. Doctor Martinus Lutherus vult sic habere, sic volo sic iubeo.

You have not more. You reply, Where the Command is for preaching, Matth. 28. the Restraint is added. What Restraint? None at all. When sent as lawful Missioners to preach Christs Doctrine Then They could deliver no Other Doctrine sent by Him, and as Members of the Church then founded. Herein they could neither go beyond,

nor fall short of their Commission. I say as sent; For no man, God knows, saith that the Apostles or 70. Disciples, or the Pastors of the Catholick Church were, or are Infallible in every Ordinary matter, wherof they casually discoursed.

How far the Apostles and true Pastors are Infallible.

5. Well. But the Message, These 70. Disciples were sent upon, required no Infallible Assistance; For they were not to deliver fully *Christs Doctrin*, But only to ptepare for it, By telling their Hearers, *That the Kingdom of God is at hand*. Here is also more then is probable, or, can be proved: For, is it probable, think ye, That these 70. sent to preach, reiterated nothing but these few words *The Kingdom of God is at hand*? Is it probable that They were so Young-tyed, as to say nothing at all of this Kingdom, of *Christs Sacred Virtues*, or of his Miracles, wherby He founded this Kingdom &c. Be it how you will, They were Infallible at least in the delivery of that Message: For had *Christ* (sent by his Eternal Father) *Personally* delivered the Message, He had spoken Infallibly; But, saith the Text, *He who Hear's you bear's me*; Ergo these 70. were Infallible in the Message they delivered. You reply again. *Though*

*An obje-
cion.*

the Apostles and those 70. Disciples were supposed infallible Before Christ Ascension, yet nothing can be drawn from Hence for the Churches continuall Infallibility. First, Becaus were Sent abroad by Christ, when there were no Infallible Writings, containing Christs Doctrin. 2. They had sufficient Evidences of Miracles, in curing diseases and casting out Devils, to attest that Infallibility.

Answered.

To this second I answered above, That the Church hath the like Evidence 'of Infallibility by *Miracles, Casting of Devils* &c. The first Objection is Proofles, Becaus Infallible writings alone, make no man Infallible, as is evident in all known Hæreticks, who have Gods Infallible Word, yet most certainly pervert it. *There is therefore as much need of an Infallible Teacher to learn us*

new

Disc. II. C. VI. Protestants interpreting Scripture. 183

now infallibly, what that Written Word speaks in a hundred As great
controversied Points, as then was necessary to declare the Sub- necessity
stance of Christs Doctrin, which he delivered by Word of now to
mouth. I say the substance, for without all doubt, learn us
the Apostles and the 70. said explicitly, much mo- what Scri-
re in thir Preaching, then meerly what Christ had pture
implicitly, and in fewer words commanded them to Speak's, as
Preach, yet They neither did nor could swerve in what
any Doctrinal Point. Therefore in the publishing Christ
his Doctrin, They had the Assistance of the Holy Ghost tonghs.
before his Ascension, Though it was then more amply
confirmed, and promised anew, not only to the Apost-
les then living, But also to their Successors for ever.

6. And this is what our Saviour Dogmatically Gods Spi-
Teaches John 14. 16. of a Comforter the Holy Ghost, rit with
who shall abide with you for ever; which words (im- his Church
plying a continual aboad) cannot but be understood for ever.
in an Absolute sense. Yes, say They, He shall be
with them for ever, But how? Mark the gloss, in
regard of Consolation and Grace. A meer Guess. Not only
The only question is whether it hitt's right or no? for Conso-
For, who tell's you, Sr, That this and no other is lation and
the Absolute sense of Christs Words? Why may Grace.
They not as well import the Assistance of Infallibility,
as that of Consolation and Grace. Prove your Gloss,
and by Scripture; This we urge for. We Catho-
licks say, without drawing further Proof from either
Councils or Fathers, which you hold Fallible, That
Christs following words John 16. 13. When that Spirit
of Truth shall come, he will teach you all Truth, taken in
their obviouse sense, warrants this Infallible Assistance
for ever. Can your Fallible Spirit assure me of the
con-

contrary? You say, Yes: For these last Words are Restrained to the Apostles only. Here is another Gloss or Guess, as unlucky as the former: For who Restrains here, *Christ* or You? If you do it, you may as well restrain the Consolation of Grace to all the Apostles Successors, as *Infallible Assistance*.

Consolation
of grace
nothing in
a whole
Church
without
Infallibi-
lity.

7. We prove both the One and the Other Blessing granted to the Church by our Saviours own Words, *Mat. 28. 20. I am with you always to the end of the world*; and moreover Affirm, that the Consolation of Grace granted the Church (whose duty is to Teach us Truth) Benefit's little in order to that End, unless it be accompanied with the further Privilege of infallibility. For, *what comfort hath Any (whether Learned or Illicerate) to Hear, that the Pastors of Christs Church, have much interior Consolation and Grace, if this sorrowful Thought afflict his hart? All and every one of these Pastors, notwithstanding the plenty of their Grace, may cheat him into damnable Error, and teach, There is neither God, Heaven, nor Hell.*

The Consolation of
Grace and
want of
Divine
Assistance
uncompensable in the
whole
Church.

8. I might further show, How utterly inconsistent this supposed, and yet *Unexplicated Consolation* of Grace is, with the Spirit of a whole Church which may Deceive us. But the thing need's no Proof, for it is evident, That God, who hath promised to direct us by his Pastors, cannot comfort them so plentifully with *Celestial Inspirations*, and Permit all to delude and cosen us with Pernicious Errors. Will he give them grace, Think ye, to Talk only, and not to teach *his Verities* certainly? To live hōily (for his grace serves for some end) and Leave them to a Possi-

Disc. II. C. IV. *Protestants interpreting Scripture.* 185

Possibility of Corrupting his Spouse, his own Sanctified Church with fals Doctrin? This in a word is to tell God, *That he court's the watchmen of his Church with Heavenly Consolation, who nevertheles may Betray his Cause, and give up his Citty to the Devil when they please; For here in They are left to their own wills and Fancies.* ^{God Courts not his Church with comfort, and permit's it to betray his truths.} God you know is Truth, and He loves Truth. Truth is that which he first established in his Church, And it Answers to that first Operation of Christian, which is Divine Faith, the ground of all Sanctity. To tell me therefore, *That He comforts a whole Church by Grace, and yet leaves it so tottering upon Vncersainties, That none can with absolute Assurance say, He either teaches, or hear's Truth delivered in any Article of Christian Faith, is worse then a meer Chimara, And makes our Bountifull Lord not only a very Niggard of his Graces, But also gives him a most high Affront.* ^{A Paradox of self-right.} The Grace therfore of Consolation, which he allowes his Church, as a Church, ever im- ^{The comfort of Grace supposeth the favour of Infallibility.} plyes, or supposeth that Arch-favour of Infallible Assistance. Rob it of this Priviledge, and other Graces, avail little.

9. And here by the way, I must needs propose one question to our Protestants. It is, whether God, Supposing his Promises already made, can according to their Principles, permit that the whole Church (Vnassisted by his infallible Spirit) loose, with- ^{A question proposed, whether the Church can withstand an loose all graces} stand, and reject what ever Grace he gives or hath given it? If they say, Yes, It is Possible. Then I Infer: God can permit that the Whole Church may turn Traitor, and become Impious; For a Church which withstands, looseth, or rejects all Grace, is traiterous and impious. If they say no, it

.A a

is

*Truth as
necessary
to the
Church as
Grace.*

is against his Goodnes to permit such a Universal Impiety. They must acknowledge, That he cannot but preserve a Church for ever (whether consisting of Elect or no, we dispute not) in his Grace and favour, *and this infallibly.* Ergo I say, He cannot buth Infallibly alio (supposing his Promises). Preserve it *in Truth* by the special Assistance of his own Unerring Spirit, *Truth* being, as all know, as necessary to the Church as *Grace* is. And thus we se in notorious great Sinners, who, although they have a thousand Incitements of Grace to amend their lives, yea, better themselves by it in some particulars, yet as long as Divine Truth necessary to Christians is wanting, Their state is Desplorable. To conclude then, Here is my Dilemma. Either it is possible, That the whole Church, That is, All the Teachers, and Hearers in it, may abandon all Gods Revealed Verities, and neither Teach nor Hear one Word of his Truth or 'tis impossible. If the first be granted: 'Tis not only possible, that the whole Church may revolt from God and Truth, But may loose all Grace likewise. Grant this, and say next what will become of our Protestants *Elect people*, who Becaus Predestinated to Eternal life, cannot but have Grace? Observe well the Paradox. They cannot Loose grace, yet 'tis possible never to hear a *Word of Truth*; For all their Ministers are fallible. What kind of Elect are these who have Certainty of Grace, but no certainty of Truth with it? Now, if on the other side they hold it *impossible*, That the whole Church may desert Gods Truths, They grant what we ask, And must say it hath the *infallible Assistance* we plead for. The

*A Paradox
of Catholics*

Reason

Reason hereof I have amply delivered in the former Discours Chap. 3. Because al the Human science, Wit, or Learning in Nature alone, can no more Secure a Church from Error, Then give it Grace. God therefore doth, and will ever graciously prevent it with both these Blessings, And as Infallibly keep it Sound in Truth, as Holy and Sanctified.

God preserves his Church as Sound in Truth as Sanctified by Grace.

C H A P. VII.

More of this Subject.

1. **B**Y what is said in this short Digression, you see how pitifully our new men mangle the Text now Cited: *I am with you Always to the End of the World.* Hear their Gloss. Yes say They. This Promise was made to the Apostles and their Successors, But in a different degree: For it was of continual and infallible Assistance to the Apostles; but to their Successors of continual and fitting assistance, but not infallible. The like is repeated afterward, when They ask, *What we say to this?* Marry, Sr, I say, it's nothing to the Purpose. For you neither declare what *this fitting continual assistance* granted these Successors (as distinct from the other, allowed the Apostles) is, nor can you declare these different Degrees. And though you did so, contrary to the Churches sense, you only vent your own feeble and fallible Sentiments without Proof, which I neither ought, nor can in Prudence Believe. To be plain Therefore, be pleased to Answer. Hath God Revealed

Protestants trivial Distinction of Fitting and infallible Assistance.

They still run on in Generals.

ed to you what this *sitting and continual Assistance* granted the Apostles Successors is? No. Doth any Ancient Council or Unanimous consent of Fathers *Mince* These Words, and Dogmatize here as you do, or, only mention a Presence of the Spirit of *consolation* and Grace, excluding *infallible Assistance*? No. All is contrary, as I could demonstrate, were it here my task to prove Truth against you (but this is done by others) as 'tis *to force you to prove what your Fancy only vents against it*. And mark how Fancy goes to work. *Christ* saith, *I am with you always to the end of the world*: That is, saith your Fancy, He is present by *his Spirit by a sitting Assistance*, But not by an Assistance Infallible. This gloss, *Not by infallible Assistance is your own*; For neither Gods Word, nor Vniversal Church, nor General Council, nor the Consent of Fathers, nor Antiquity ever uttered any Thing like it. Grant therefore it be Vnreasonable, as you say, to put your Party to prove a *Negative*, *Viz.* That any of the Fathers denied this place to *extend to infallibility*, I am sure, it is most Reasonable to force you to a Proof of your own *Affirmative*: For you doctrinally Teach, That *Christ* in this place Allows no *certain Infallibility* to his Church. This, because *positively asserted*, is positively to be made good, by a more strenuous Proof than Fancy only. You say again. Those of your Party only delivered what they Conceived to be the Meaning of this, and other Places of Fathers, which do no more, then prove the *Perpetuity* of the Church. What They conceived weak fallible Men? Pray, what am I the better for their Concepts? Must I change my Ancient Faith, for the Rowling, and never

*Refutes
Concepts
instead of
Proofs.*

Disc. II. C. VII. *Protestants interpreting Scripture.* 189
 ver agreeing Fancies of a few Ministers? Why may
 not an *Arian* or *Pelagian* (if sole conceiving can do it)
 as well gain me to his party, as a Protestant to His,
 who *Thinks* that the Church is Fallible? To that of
 the Fathers. I Answer, Their indubitable owning a
 Church *Perpetual*, Evidently (could we say no more)
 supposeth a Church constantly True and Holy, And
 the Constant Truth of it implies infallible Assistance,
 as is already proved.

2. Protestants may yet reply. They deliver what
 they conceive to be the Sense of *Christ's Words*: *I am*
with you always &c. Catholics can do no more, and
 Mark well. As the words do not *explicitly* exclude
 Infallible Assistance from the Church always, so nei-
 ther do They explicitly include it: For *Christ* saith not
explicitly, I will be always with you to the End of the
 World *by my Infallible Assistance*. Thus then the ca-
 se stands. *They* *Restrain Christ's Promise*, and we see to
Extend it too far. *They* *(we say)* *come to short of the Sen-*
se, by cutting of *Infallible Assistance*. We Catholics
(They say) *go beyond the Bounds*, and add more to the
Text than Christ Spoke. Both of us therefore are Glossers,
 and why is not Their Gloss as Orthodox as Ours?
 Here is a better Objection than any hitherto proposed;
 And, the Solution might easily end all Controversies,
 would Sectaries pleas to wave a few *Self-conceits*, and
 prudently Acquiesce to Reason, whilst Truth plead's
 againsts their Errors.

3. First then (though I press not much this Point) 'tis evident,
 That we Catholics are the *Elder Brothers*, as Numerous at least as They,
 and (to speak modestly) as Learned. Why therefore when both They

A a 3

and

An Objection

The Solution of it Ends all Controversies.

Sectaries have no Reason to prefer their Interpretations.

190 Disc. II. C. VII. *The new Mode of*
 and We interpret Scripture, and stand as it were
 equally ballanced, becaus 'tis *yet supposed* uncertain,
 who guesseth better, why is not, I say, Our Inter-
 pretation (could we prove no more) as good as Theirs,
 contrary to us? If They prefer Their Gloss before
 Ours, something of Weight, beside meer Fancy,
 must turn the Scales, and *Ballance more* for them then
 us? We alwayes ask for this greater Poyse in con-
 troverted matters, and can get no answer.

*To these of
 Catholicks.*

*An unwor-
 thy proceed-
 ing of Se-
 ctaries.*

4. Secondly: I must necessarily here Note an un-
 worthy proceeding of Sectaries with us, when we
 Produce *Scripture, Fathers, or Councils* for Catholick Do-
 ctrin. Their humor (and 'tis a a strange one) run's
 on thus. First They begin with their Glosses, and
 labor to pervert that Sense which the Catholick owns.
 And if after much Trifling they can *Disguise this Sense,*
 or *Twine* it of from the Catholick Meaning, They hold
 the Work done, and cry Victory. Mark in our present
 matter Their Frigid way of Arguing (and it is alike in
 all other Controversies) That Text say They; *The*
Holy Ghost will teach you all Truth, may be Restrained to
 the Apostles only. That other, *The Church is the Pil-
 lar and ground of Faith*, may have the Sense They allow,
 of, and no more. This Promise of our Saviour, *I*
will be with you always &c. May exclude *Infallibility*.
 And when They bring the Close of a Point debated,
 to their own *Self-seeming*, it may be; They think all
 safe. Whereas 'tis most evident, that nothing is yet
 so much as probably concluded: For, as They say,

*The bare
 Saying of
 Sectaries
 stand's for
 no proof.*

*The Sense of these Places now cited, May be as Protestants un-
 derstand; so, I say, The contradictory Proposition is every
 whis as good. The Sense May be as Catholicks understand.*

Who

Disc. II. C. VII. *Protestants interpreting Scripture.* 191

Who must Therefore, whilst we are Both yet supposed to stand; as it were, on equal Terms, Determine what God hath absolutely Revealed in these Scriptures? I say absolutely; For the question here is not what a Particular man may *Imagin* God to have Spoken; But what He hath *de facto* Spoken. The Reason hereof is clear. Because God Speaks not in so weighty a Matter as this is to Try mens Wits, or to Hear Them tell him. *Lord such may be the Sense of your words;* Faith relies not on what private men think God hath revealed. Though I cannot say what it is; Nor can our Faith Rely on what we only Think He may have Spoken; But on what He hath actually Revealed, And we have means (thanks be to God) To know this Absolute Sense, as I shall declare in the 9. Chapter where the Objection is fully solved.

5. In the mean time be pleased to reflect first: That when meer Fallible men Peremptorily put upon Scripture a Sense, which They cannot so much as probably prove (But by their own Erring guesses only) to be the true meaning of the Holy Ghost (and this in a matter which Highly concerns Salvation) They plainly Injure Gods Sacred Word. Protestants are these fallible men, and do so; Ergo, they injure Gods Word. The first Proposition is clear in the Case of Arians, who, Because They peremptorily give a Sense to those Scriptures which relate to the Real Unity of Three Persons in one Divine Essence (the matter is of High importance) and cannot prove it, But by the force of Their Erring Guesses only, They wrong both God and his Word. The second Proposition is as Evident; For Protestants absolutely say, The Scriptures now cited, include not (yea, positively exclude a perpetual infallibility.

Protestants Glosses as injurious to Gods Word as Those of the Arians.

The Proof.

libility allowed the Church) This sense (and 'tis a Point of highest Importance, For the clearing of it End's all Contróversies) they cannot prove, But by their own Erring guesses only, And therefore injure Scripture, in saying God hath spoken that, which cannot be so much as probably proved, was Spoken.

6. Reflect 2. It is not enough, that Sectaries tell us upon their own fallible *Parole*, That our Places of Scripture *May* be interpreted as they please, or, come not home to prove the Churches Infallibility; For Admit thus much *Gratis*, They yet convince nothing: Because it is *one thing* to say (and God knows only to say it) our alleged Scriptures (for example that of St. Paul, *The Church is the pillar and ground of Truth*) prove not a Church Infallible, and a *quite other*, *positively* to Teach and prove it, *so be Fallible*. The most they can infer out of this *Negative*: *Such places prove not*, were all granted they desire, is that They give the *slip* to so many Texts of Scripture, or infringe so much force of our Proofs. Alas, This only is to pull, as it were, so much of a House down; But it doth not therefore follow, that They positively give in as good Texts to the contrary *sense*, or, Build up the Structure of their new Doctrin concerning the Churches *Fallibility*. To pull down one Proof, is not to destroy *all we can say* (we have more Strings to our Bow then one) much les is it to build up an opposite Doctrin. The Machin these Sectaries would fain build, lyes in this one *positive Assertion*. *The whole Church is Fallible*. This, say I, Fancy only *Erect's*; For it stands unprop't, That is, it neither is, nor can, nor shall ever be *positively proved*. And hence

Sectaries come not home to the difficulty.

To say we prove not our Doctrin is not to say They prove the contrary.

Their weaken- deavour is to pull down, not to build up the Machin of their new Doctrin.

Fancy doth all with them.

Disc. II. C. VII. *Protestants interpreting Scripture.* 193

7. Reflect 3. If Protestants, who rely totally on Scripture Proof, *Positively* Assert, as They do, That the whole Church is Fallible, They are obliged both in Conscience and all Law of Disputation, to prove what They say: For *Asserenti incumbit probatio*. Observe my reason. When Luther and *Sectaries* came amongst us, and troubled the world, They heard the voice of a whole Ancient Church against them, owning the infallible Assistance of Gods Directing Spirit, for which we now argue. The Church pleaded thus: *Olim possideo, prior possideo*. This Spirit of infallibility I long since have had, and yet, upon Scripture proof do Believe. Well. Now enter these *Sectaries*, and first Reject the Authority of this Ancient Church; next They fall aboard with our Scriptures, And becaus they are good at Gueffing, They tell us: *Verily, These Scriptures seem not to prove a Church Infallible, Becaus They are able to interpret all to a contrary Sense.* To this we have Answered. Their seeming is no proof. Withall, That Catholicks as Many and Learned as They, both can and do interpret them otherwise. Hitherto therefore, their cause is nothing Advanced. More then is necessary, And it is, That whilst They *positively* establish a new coynded Doctrin of a whole Christian Church fallible, contrary to what Antiquity ever owned, I say, 't is necessary, That they bring some Positive proof, and make good Their unheard of Assertion.

8. And here we may have plain dealing if *Sectaries* please. Turn then to your Bible, Gentlemen, and shew me any Text like this. *The whole Church of Christ, is not the Pillar and ground of Truth.* The Holy

*They first
reject
Church
Authority
and then
make Scri-
pture speak
as Fancy
pleases.*

*Protestants
have no
Text of
Scripture
against an
infallible
Church.*

Ghost will not ever Teach it all Truth. God hath placed Pastors and Doctors in his Church, But such as may suffer us to be carried away with every wind of fals Doctrin &c. Such Expressions we read in our Bible for the contrary Verity, Have you any thing like them in yours, to prove your opposite Asserted Doctrin? I say any like them; For I Press not to have from you the same Formal Words, But will be content with one plain significant Text (and we will stand to Scripture, Or if Scripture please you not, we will accompany you to Councils and Fathers) which so much as Meanly makes the whole Church of Christ Fallible? Such a Scripture, I tell you once more, you cannot produce. Ergo, you only vent your Fancies, you talk and prove not; you believe a Doctrin which you cannot show was ever Revealed in Gods Word. You may perhaps trifle it out, and Tell us, as you are wont to do, of our errors de facto. It is nothing to the purpose: For we enquire not here after your proofles Assertions (They are Answered a hundred times over) nor ask, what you fallible Teachers say, but what God hath said in Scripture concerning the fallibility of a whole Christian Church. This we wish to hear of, before we credit your Talk, or Believe, for your saying, It hath erred de facto.

*What we
desire of
Seditious.*

CHAP.

C H A P. VIII.

The new Mode of Sectaries misinterpreting Scripture destroyes Protestant Religion.

1. **H**ere we give you a fourth Reflection consequent to the former Discours, which follows upon our Sectaries misinterpretation of Scripture. 'Tis worth the Readers knowledge, and if I mistake not, totally Ruin's Protestant Religion. Thus it is. The whole Machin of Protestancy, as *Protestancy*, stands Protestancy stands toppling upon supposed Objective Negatives, built up by Fancy only, without so much as one positive proof of Scripture to support it. If I evidence not this Truth (and consequently do not convince) That our Sectaries have no Faith, Deny me credit Hereafter.

2. Observe well. No sooner do these Sectaries perswade Themselves, That they can *Abate* the force of our *Scripture-proofs* for Catholick Doctrin; But They How They proceed farther an Negatives presently lay hold on the quite contrary Doctrin, And make that an Article of their new Faith. They say, we prove not a *Church infallible*; Therefore the contrary Position. *The Church is fallible*, is with them a certain Truth. They say, we prove not a third place of *Purgatory*; Therefore the Belief of no *Purgatory* is an Article of Protestants Faith. We prove Mark These 18th sentences,

196 Disc.H.C.VIII. *Their misinterpreting Scripture*
 not *Christs Real Presence* in the *Holy Eucharist* ; Therefore
 the Belief of his *Not-presence* constitutes part of Prote-
 stants Doctrin. We prove not the *Popes Supremacy*;
Ergo, They Believe the Contrary &c. To show their
Nullity of Faith, shall we here condescend to what
 They say, And contrary both to Conscience and ma-
 nifest Truth, suppose with them, the Proofs for our
 Doctrins to be proofles? *Be it so supposed as presents.*
 Pray you say next, What are They able to infer upon
 such a fals Concession? Marry thus much. If we
 prove no Purgatory, There is surely no such Place.
 If we prove not the Church Infalible, it is certain-
 ly Fallible, and so of the rest. I answer. This
 Sequele is *Non-sense*, and a pure *Non sequitur*. We pro-
 ve not; *Ergo*, *The contrary Doctrin is true*. For how
 many Things are there both *Actual* and *Possible*, which
 men prove not, and yet are so? A young student
 in Mathematicks cannot perhaps prove, that the Sun
 is greater then a Sieve; Is it therfore consequent
 That, that luminous body is not Greater? The
 Proof is naught, *And here is all that follows*. One
 thing then it is in our present Case, *To say our Proofs*
for Catholick Doctrin fall short, or, are forceles; And a qui-
te Other to say they fall upon falsities. *Ergo* no absolute De-
 nial of these Catholick Verities is deducible from our not pro-
 ving them. Yet upon this fals supposed negative founda-
 tion, We prove not, *All Protestant Religion stands tottering*
as it doth.

*These Se-
 quels are
 deeply Non
 sense.*

*Proofs may
 fall short,
 and yet not
 fall upon
 falsities.*

3. Be pleased to hear more of this Stuff. Let us
 also falsly suppose, as our Sectaries will have it, that
 These may be objective Truths and Verities: No
 Church is infalible: There is no Purgatory &c. Doth it
 follow

Disc. II. C. VIII. *Ruin's Protestant Religion.* 197

follow, think ye, That they can believe *These Negatives* with Divine and stedfast Faith, upon the Con-
 cession That they are now *supposed Truths*? No. It
 is a lame Consequence, and a wors *Non sequitur* Then
 the other. Observe my Reason. No *Objective*
Verity, *Although supposed True in it self, can be believed by* *Every*
Divine Faith, Unless God hath positively Revealed it, or, is at *Truth is*
least clearly Deducible from Scripture; So Sectaries As- *not a ma-*
 sert, and upon this ground, That Divine Faith besi- *terial Ob-*
 des a Material Object *Believable*, requires also (and *ject of*
 this essentially) the weight of a *Formal Object*, which *Faith.*
 is Gods Veracity to reveal that which is believed by
 Faith. Seclude *this Veracity* from the *Motive and For-*
mal object of our Assent, Though we yeild to a thou- *A lame*
 sand Verities, not one of them can be believed by *Conse-*
 Faith. *quences.*

4. Now I Assume: *But the fallibility of Christs who-*
le Church, The not being of Purgatory, The not Exi- *That there*
stency of Christ Body in the Sacred Eucharist, and so of the *is no Pur-*
 rest, Are no where positively revealed by God; no, *gatory, no*
 nor clearly deduced from any Text in Scripture. *Real Pre-*
ence &c.
 go, Although these were *Truths* in themselves, yet *is no where*
 they are not *revealed Truths*, or Truths spoken by Al- *Reveal'd*
 mighty God. Therefore they are insufficient to found *by God,*
 Divine Faith. The Major is granted by Protestants.
 The Minor, *viz.* That these supposed Truths were *Ergo,*
 never spoken by Almighty God in Scripture, is so *Cannot be*
 undeniably evident, That here I am forced to cha- *Articles of*
 lenge Sectaries to produce so much as one Text, *Protestant*
 wherein God hath Positively said: *There is no Purgato-*
ry, No real Presence &c. This they cannot do by
 so much as by a probable *Deduction* from Scripture, *Faith.*

198 Disc. II. C. VIII. *Their misinterpreting Scripture*

*An Evident Con-
clusion
against Se-
paratists.*

much less by plain Scripture it self. The Conclusion therefore follows evidently. They Believe not what God hath Revealed, and consequently want Faith in the Articles they Assent to as Protestants. Nay, I say more. They cannot Assent to These Articles as evident Truths; For no received Principle either in Nature or Grace can evidence so much as the *supposed objective* Verity of These Doctrins. Shall I yet add a word, and say, That no Proof grounded upon *weighty moral Reason*, can evidence, these *negative Assertions* to be Truths morally known? Therefore though hitherto we have supposed them to pass for Verities, yet in real earnest They are unproved and no other, But the weak Thoughts of our Adversaries strong Fancy? Now here, If I mistake not, You see Ruin enough of Protestant Religion, which stand's upon a Fancied Opinion only, and not upon what God hath Revealed in his Sacred Word. No, nor can probably be made known by any received Principle.

*And the
Ruin of
Protestant
Religion, as
Protestan-
cy.*

5. To conclude this point, I Argue thus. These Negative Articles, *No purgatory, No Church infallible &c.* Are either essential Pieces of Protestant Religion, or not. If not: There is no such thing as Protestant Religion in the world; For the Reformed part of it, is wholly made up of such Negatives, *No Purgatory, No Transubstantiation, No unbloody Sacrifice, No Praying to Saints, No Church infallible &c.* Cast then these, and the like away, *Protestancy* dwingles to nothing? Now, if on the other side, They hold these as Articles of Protestantcy, And say, They ought to be believed by Divine Faith, They are obliged to shew (which is utterly impossible) that God hath Positively revealed them in Scripture. Therefore I say: *Though we*
admi

*An unan-
swerable
Dilemma.*

Disc. II. C. VII. *Ruin's Protestant Religion.* 199

Admit of such Negatives as Objective Truths in Themselves, yet, so long as they are not proved to be positive revealed Truths, or, Spoken by Almighty God, Protestantcy stands like a starveling, void and empty of all revealed Truths, And consequently, as it is, this New Religion, hath no one part of its Doctrin warranted by him, who upholds all Christian Verities, I mean Gods certain Revelation.

Protestancy as so, hath no one part of its Doctrin warranted by God.

6. To se this Assertion more clearly Evidenced, Hear a little what our Sectaries Answer.. Some tell us: They know right well, there is no Purgatory, *Because God hath not revealed it in Scripture.* There is no real Presence for the same Reason, and so they Argue for the rest of their Negatives. To this and whatever els can be proposed, we have answered. Though, These Suppositions are very Fals, yet Admit of them as True. *Viz. That a Purgatory, or Real Presence are not mentioned in Scripture:* All that follows from hence, is, That God hath been, as it were, *Silent*, and omitted to speak of such Objects. That is, as we now *falsly suppose*, He hath neither said there is a Purgatory nor Denied it. Now this Negative, *God hath said nothing of such a matter, as it cannot Ground a positive Belief of a Purgatory, so it cannot Ground a positive Belief of the Contrary, or, No Purgatory.* Whilst therefore the Catholick Believes a Purgatory, He is obliged to show that God hath *Positively* Revealed it: And if the Protestant Believe *no Purgatory*, He is also Obligated to show that God hath spoken *Positively* this Objective Truth, *There is no such place.* To say then: God hath made no mention at all of a Purgatory in Scripture, and to infer from Thence a Belief,

Protestants inferences, Still proved improbable.

What both Catholics and Protestants are obliged to prove.

200 Disc. II. & VIII. *Their misinterpreting Scripture*
lief of no Purgatory, is in plain Language to Say: I may
Actually Believe that by Divine Faith, which God never
Spake. The most therefore, That can be Deduced
 from this Negative, were it True, God hath Omitted to
 Reveal a Purgatory, is, That no man yet knows, nor can
 know upon Revelation, whether there be such a Place or no.
 But to draw from it an Absolute Faith of no Purgatory, is
 (and I can term it no better) then the last of Non-
 sense. For, how many Things are there known
 to God, Which He hath omitted to Reveal? Can I
 Therefore, upon that Non-Revelation, Rush on them
 with my Faith, and Believe them for his not speaking
 at all? Yet thus Sectaries Proceed. They have
 good store of Negatives, But not revealed Negatives,
 And They will Believe them, Because God hath not Revealed
 them. Here briefly is my Discours, if it Faulter, or
 seem Faulty to our Adversaries, my humble Petition
 is, That they will Vouchsafe to unbeguill' me, and
 Friendly shew me where the Fallacy lyes.

Protestants
 Believe Ne-
 gatives be-
 cause God
 hath not
 Reveal'd
 them.

If this
 Discourse
 be faulty,
 my wish is
 so hear of
 the fallacy.

One Reply
 refused.

Sectaries
 agree not in
 Doctrine.

7. Some perhaps will say. We have Fought all this
 while with Shadows, And supposed These Negatives,
 No Purgatory, No Transubstantiation &c. To be Objects of
 Protestants Faith. But we err, not knowing Their
 Doctrin; For, They are only Held Inferiour Truths,
 Approved by the English Church to maintain Union amongst
 Protestants, And not owned as Articles of Faith. Thus
 Two later Men, whom you may se largely Refuted
 Discours 3. c. 6. n. 7. All I'll say at present is: Be-
 cause Sectaries seldom Agree in Doctrin, it is im-
 possible to Confute them all at Once. To my
 purpose then. There have been Certainly, And are
 yet Protestants (I think These the more Numerous)
 That

Disc. II. C. VIII. *Ruin's Protestant Religion.* 201

That Hold the now named *Negatives*, *Articles of Protestants Faith*, And Against such our Proofs have Force : Others, that Deny the Doctrin, And exclude them from being *Articles* are in a worse Condition ; Because upon the *Supposition*, They are Forced to grant, That *Protestancy*, as *Protestancy*, contain's not so much as *One Article of Divine Faith* in it ; For, the whole *Reformed part of it is made up of pure Negatives*. Consequently, if Any should utterly Abjure that Religion, He would not *Abjure one Truth Revealed by Almighty God*. See more of this subject in the place now cited, And know, That our Adversaries will have Much to do, To come of Handsomly, whether They Grant These *Negatives To be Articles of their Faith*, or *Disown them as Articles*. This is fairly spoken, without Clamours, And Believe it. Some who tell us, They have not Leisure Enough to kill flies, may sweat at it (take whether part They please) before the Difficulty be solved.

Some own these Negatives Articles of Faith.

Protestancy hath no Articles of Faith.

Both are Confuted.

Mr. Stillingfleet in his Preface to the Reader.

8. They may Reply secondly, And Endeavor to Prove at least one of their *Negatives* Thus. There is no *Purgatory* ; Because God hath Revealed in Scripture two Places only, *Heaven*, and *Hell*, which seem's Exclusive of a third Place. I answer, That word *Only* is neither *Scripture*, nor *Revelation*. Cast therefore that *Particle* away, and Propose the Argument as we ought to do, And it falls to nothing. Thus it is. God hath Revealed two Places, and these Eternal, it is most True. Ergo he hath Revealed the *not Being* of a *Purgatory* is False, and a meer *Non-sequitur*.

A second Reply of Secularies worth Nothing.

9. They may Reply thirdly. Catholicks Believe many things upon as pure *Negatives* ; for Example : A

A Third as bad.

Cc

Tri-

202 Disc. II. C. VII. *Their misinterpreting Scripture*

*Catholicks
believe not
upon Negative
grounds.*

Trinity of Three Distinct Persons in one Divine Essence, and 10 *Quaternity*, or, no more Persons than Three; yet this *Negative* is not Revealed in Scripture. To Help on this *worthles* Argument I Grant more; That not so much as a *Trinity*, of Distinct Persons, is plainly Revealed in Scripture; Doth it Therefore follow, that Catholicks Believe that Mystery and Deny a *Quaternity* upon Negative Grounds? No such matter. They Believe a Trinity and no Quaternity, upon the solid Positive Grounds of their Church *Interpreting Scripture*, upon a Universal Perpetuated Tradition, And the Infallible Word of God *not Written*. Protestants are destitute of such Proofs in the Articles they Hold. For, They neither have an Infal-
lible Church, nor Tradition, Nor *Written*, nor *Un-
written* Word to Rely on. Therefore They Believe upon Fancy only.

*An Obje-
ction an-
swered con-
cerning
Novelties
introduced
into the
Church.*

10. To End This Matter, I will here Briefly (Be-
cause it is Consequent) Answer to an old Trivial Ob-
jection made by Sectaries against our Present Roman
Church, which They Accuse of *Novelties* introduced
since the First Primitive Ages. And weakly, as They
are wont, Argue after this manner. Your Doctrins
of *Transubstantiation*, of *Praying to Saints*, of an *Unbloody
Sacrifice* &c. Were not Taught for Three, or Four
Ages after *Christ*. Therefore, say They, We may
now well hold the Contrary, And Believe no *Transub-
stantiation*, no *Sacrifice* &c. I answer. Admit of this
most fals Supposition, *These Doctrins were not Taught*.
No Faith at all can be founded on this *Negative*, Before
(which will never be) They Prove their *contrary Doctrin*
Positively Revealed by Almighty God in Scripture. For, this
Princi-

*Sectaries
found Faith
on a Nega-
tive.*

Principle stands irrefragably Sure; No Revelation, No Faith; Although the Object Assented to be True. All

the pains Therefore, These men take to reduce Their Reformed Gospel to the Model of the Primitive Church, is upon several Respects meer labor lost; But upon this Account Chiefly it

faulters most, That They cannot show one Negative believed by

them to be a Revealed Truth to any Christian Society in the World. . . . It is pitiful to hear how they fumble in this

Discours. . . . We Ask how they prove, that the Primitive Church held no Unbloody Sacrifice (put this for one example, it serves for all.) Some Answer.

They find no such thing as a Sacrifice registred in those Ancient Writings. . . . Mark the Proof. They

find it not, Ergo it is not to be found. Catholicks as clear Sighted as others, find that Doctrin expressly

Asserted; But, becaus Protestants are^e pleased to Deny all, They must, and, upon their Own word, be Thought

the Men of more Credit. Well. But Suppose the Doctrin was not Registred in those Ancient Records;

Is this Consequence good? It was not Writ, Ergo it was not Taught. No certainly; Vnles They show, all

Taught Doctrin was then Writ, or Registred. But, let us falsly Suppose, that the Doctrin was neither Writ nor

Taught; Doth it follow, that the Contrary of no Sacrifice, now believed by Protestants, was a Truth Revealed

to that Church, or taught by it? No. Therefore they are here driven again upon the old Negative,

And thus it is. That Church said nothing of an Vnbloody Sacrifice, which is Hideously Vntrue, Ergo Protestants can now Believe no Sacrifice, which is Hideously fals, and as un-

lucky a Sequel as This: That Church said not, whether the Moon be a watery Body full of Rocks, Ergo,

They can not show one of Their Negatives Revealed to any Ancient Orthodox Church.

The Inferences of Sacraments unconcluding.

204 Disc. II. C. VIII. *Their misinterpreting Scripture*
 Protestants can Believe the contrary with *Divine Faith*.
 You will Say we Trifle now; For, that Church was
 Perfect in Faith, and either held a Sacrifice or Denied
 it. I answer in Real Truth, it Plainly and *undeniably*
Held a Sacrifice, yet must withal Affirm, Though
 we Falsly suppose (And this fals Supposition must be
 vigilantly regarded) that it only *Negatively* abstracted
 from such Doctrin; yet, Protestants are far of from
 Proving it held Positively *the Contrary*, That is, no *sac-*
rifice; which yet is Necessary to be Proved, if They
 believe no *Sacrifice* with *Divine Faith*.

No An-
 cient Fa-
 ther against
 an Unbloo-
 dy Sacrifi-
 ce.

11. They may yet Reply. They are Able at least
 to Produce some Ancient Fathers *Clearly Enough* As-
 serting no Unbloody Sacrifice; Therefore they prove this
 Negative, and so they can do Others. I utterly De-
 ny that *clearly Enough*, and say, They have not one
 Ancient Father, nor Council, nor any Approved Au-
 thority that positively Denyes a Sacrifice, (All unani-
 mously Taught the contrary as *Luther* himself confes-
 seth) Much less have They Any, that makes this their
 Doctrin a *Truth* Revealed by Almighty God, or, *ever*
taught by any Universal Church. Were therefore these
 supposed Authorities of Sectaries (which are none) and
 Reasons also for *no Sacrifice*, more Numerous and Strong
 then what the World hath Heard of hitherto; They
 cannot in Conscience suppose them Proofs, weighty
 enough to Beat down the contrary Asserted, And Un-
 deniable Doctrin not only of Fathers, *But, of a Whole*
Church. They cannot Suppose Them powerful enough
 to Build up such a *new Negative* of Protestant Religion,
 especially whilst They see before their eyes the Tor-
 rent of Antiquity against them, and our Answers re-
 turned

turned to every Trivial Objection they make? O, But they can Solve all we Object. And, we must Take their Word, Because *They say so.* We also tell them, We Solve what they Object, and yet are not Believed. Do you not see here most pitiful *Doings,* and *Controversies made Endles by this Proceeding,* when each Party saith what it pleaseth, and Gain's no Credit from the Other? A Judge, my good Friends, and an Infalible Judge is here Necessary to Decide Matters between us: But, thus far evident Reason judgeth, And Tell's you; *Though you could Solve all we say for the Affirmative of a Sacrifice, you are to seek for a Positive Proof of your Unproved, yet Believed Negative. There is no Sacrifice.* And the like I say of your other Negatives.

C H A P. IX.

*Of the Means left by Almighty God
to Interpret Scripture Truly. One
Passage More of Scripture, Pro-
ving Infalible Teachers, is
Quoted.*

1. **W**E come now to Solve more fully the Ob-
jection Proposed Chap. 7. n. 2. It was to
this Sense. *A Protestant Delivers what he Conceives to
be the Meaning of Scripture, so the Catholick doth also,*
Cc 3 and

The difficulty proposed again, is the state of the Question. and can do no more. Both of Them therefore are Glosses, the only Difficulty is, to know who Glosses better. Here.

Concerning the Interpretation of Scripture.

2. To go on Groundedly. We may with our Adversaries leave Suppose, That God hath not put a Bible into the Hands of Christians, to cause Eternal Debates concerning the Doctrin delivered in it.

God, desirous of Unity in Faith, gave us not Scripture to cause eternal Debates.

And if this be a Truth, We may secondly Suppose, That his Wise Providence (so earnestly desirous of Unity in Faith amongst Christians) hath Afforded some Means wherby we may rightly Attain to the True Sense of his Sacred Word. For, no man can imagin that Gods Intention is, That we only Read, without Arriving to the Sense of what we Read, or, which is wors, that we fall into Error by our Reading.

Providence hath afforded means, wherby we may understand Scripture.

This therefore, Providence hath Prevented by one Means or other, if carelessly we do not reject it. We may thirdly Suppose, That God, regularly speaking, Reveals to no Private man the deep Sense of Scripture (when He Reads and perhaps understands it not) By private Illustrations, new Enthusiasm's, or the Ministry of Angels, Therefore some other way is Appointed by Providence to come to the True Sense of what He Reads. The Reason is, True Religion requires a True Interpreter of the Book which founds Religion. Otherwise, God would have only carelessly, as it were, Thrown Scripture amongst Christians, And bid them Guess as well as they can at the Sense of it: They having no other means to know his Meaning. These Things Premised.

Scripture cannot interpret its self.

3. I say first. The Holy Book of Scripture, neither doth, nor can so Interpret it self as to bring Men Dissenting in Faith,

to an Accord, or Acquiescency in High Points of Controversy. The Assertion is Evident. For, could the Book clearly interpret its own Meaning, Catholics, Arians, Protestants and all Sectaries would as well Agree in one harmony of Doctrine, By force of that clear Interpretation (none of Them Denies The clear Sense of Scripture interpreted by Scripture it Self) If all agreed in the Sense of Scripture, There would be no dissenting. as they now agree in owning Scripture to be Divine. They accord not in the first, therefore Scripture is not its own interpreter. Or, if any yet, without Proof, strongly Assert so much, Most Evidently in order to these Dissenting men, it is as useless an Interpreter, as if it were none at all; For, it Composeth no Differences. Take here one Instance. Sectaries, to prove Scripture conspicuous and clear without an Interpreter, quote these and the like Places. *Thy word is a Lantern to my feet. A Lantern shining in a dark place &c.* We answer, Scriptures are truly a Light, when that outward cover of Ambiguous Words, wherein the Sense often lyes Enclosed, is broken open by a Faithful Interpreter, And withall we add, 'Tis vainly frivolous to make Them such shining Lamps, as to silence all Preaching and Interpretation: yet, this follows if Sectaries Gloze right: For it is ridiculous to interpret, or teach, that a Lantern shines, which I see bright before my Eyes. Observe well. The Protestant makes scripture clear without a Teacher. The Catholic saith, Interpretation is Absolutely Necessary. Scripture it self Delivers not in Formal Words, either the One or Other Gloze: Therefore it doth not ever Interpret it self Home, or declare its own Meaning. Nay, it cannot do so: For, all Interpretation (Properly taken) Interpretation absolutely necessary to Scripture, is

is a *New, More Clear, and Distinct* Light Superadded to the Formal Words of Scripture; But, no *Hagiographer* says, This Sacred Book makes any such new Addition of Glosses; Therefore it cannot Interpret it self. And this is what the Apostle *2. Petri 1. 20.* Seem's to teach, Scripture is not *ιδίαις ἐπιλύσεως* of its own Explanation.

4. I say 2. No Private man whether Catholick, Arian, Protestant or Other, can (upon his own Discours or Judgement only) so Interpret a Difficil Scripture with Certainty, as, to Assure any that God Speaks as He Interpreter's. The Reason is. Every Private Judgement is Fallible and lyable to Error, which Truth, that of the Apostle *Romans 3. Omnis homo mendax* Teaches: But a Judgement Fallible and lyable to error can with no Certainty give me that Sense wich God Reveals in a Difficil Place of Scripture; Therefore I cannot Trust to it, nor, assuredly Ground my Faith on such an Interpretation. And thus much Protestants Acknowledge; for, They say, Neither Church nor Ancient Fathers are to be Relyed on, as Infallible, in their Interpretation of Scripture; Therefore much less can a Minister, or Lay Man, Assume to Himself the Infallible Spirit of Interpreting, or Resolve, what a whole Universal Church is to Believe. Alas, such a man want's Certitude in what He saith, he want's a Perfect knowledge of both Scripture and Antiquity (never perhaps exactly perused) He want's a Constant Stability; for what He Judgeth this Hour, He may upon after Thoughts change the next; For, as He is Fallible, so is he also Changeable in his Judgement.

A Judgement lyable to Error cannot give certainty of the Scriptures sense.

5. Yet More. What Private Man Dare, when he
Sees

Disc II. C.IX. To interpret Scripture rightly. 209

See's the Learned of contrary Religion at debate Concerning the Sense of Scripture step in amongst Them, and say: My Masters, you are to Believe me, and Acquiesce to what I judge of the Sense &c. 'Tis I, And not You, That know Gods Meaning. Would not such a *Thing* be cast out of all Company? Yet, This is our very Case, when a new Vpstart, Puft up with his own Sentiments; Tell's either Catholick or Protestant, what the Sense of Scripture is in *Controverted Points of Faith*. And Hence, I say, The Catholick cannot Assure a Protestant, without a better Proof then His *own Opinion*, That the Sectary Err's in his *Interpretation*, nor can the Protestant, upon his own Assession, Remove the Catholick from the Judgement He makes of the Scriptures *Sense*.

Both of them are alike Fallible, if no other Certain Principle be laid hold on.

Here then is the Difference. The Catholick for his Interpretation of such Places, prudently Relyes on a firmer Ground then his *variable* Judgement. The Protestant hath nothing to uphold the Sense He Defends, But his own wavering,

and unsteady Thoughts, which are as *changeable*, as *the Moon is fallible*.

Here is the best Support for his interpretation, and Faith also. If he tell you, he hath moral assurance, or Interpret's as the Primitive Church did.

I answered above; He only *thinks* so, But Proves nothing. Let him show that the Primitive Church ever Interpreted those words: *The Church is the Pillar and ground of Truth*, as he now Interpret's them.

If he say, He Believes as his own Judgement Interpret's, I grant this is too *Pitifully True*; But what am I the better on that Account? Can

As private men, Catholicks and Protestants are both Fallible.

How moral certainty sufficient, why is it to be more granted the Sectary, then the Catholick

210 Disc. II. C. IX. *The means left by God*

we Rely on a Protestants easy, fallible, and erroneous Judgement in so Weighty a matter? At last surely, he will hit On't, And say, he Interprets as the Holy Ghost Suggesteth. Happy man did He so: But we shall find it otherwise Presently. However, because the Word is of comfort, let him hear it on Gods name, *For it is the Resolution of our whole Question.*

*The Holy
Ghost only
interprets
Scripture
Certainly.*

6. I say therfore 3. No other, But the Spirit of Truth, the Holy Ghost Interpret's Scripture certainly. John 16. 23. *When that Spirit of Truth shall come, he will Teach all Truth.* But one and a most necessary Truth is; to have Scripture faithfully Interpreted; Therfore this, the holy Ghost Teaches, if he Teach all Truth. Again, John 14. 16. He is called a Paraclete, or Comforter abyding with us for ever; But he is not a permanent Comforter, unles he Solace as well by his Spirit of Truth mentioned John 17. 19. as with other Interior Consolation. To allege more Texts, obvious to all, is needles: The Assertion delivered in These general Terms is undoubtedly True, and Protestants, I think, who endlessly talk of their Interior Spirit, will not Deny it.

The difficulty, by whom the Spirit interprets.

7. The only Difficulty which will trouble Them, is: *Seeing this Al-teaching Spirit usually Interpret's not by Private Illustrations, nor Assumes every Private man to be the Oracle wherby he speak's and interpret's: Seeing also, He leaves Scripture still as Speechles in order to its own further Explication, as it was 16. hundred years ago.* The Difficulty, I say, is to find out that Oracle (And a Christian Society it must be, for Angels are not Interpreters) wherin He Presides as Master, and by it interpret's Scripture. Find this Speaking Oracle out, and we have enough. Hear it, and we hear Truth. To our purpose then.

Disc. II. C. IX. *To interpret Scripture rightly.* 211

8. Doth this Spirit of Truth Reside in the late, and hardly yet well known Congregation of Protestants? Doth he Teach and Interpret Scripture by this Society of men? No, Most certainly, no: For, that Society wherein This All-knowing Spirit *Presides as Master*, is *Taught infallibly*. Those, He instructs to Interpret Scripture, Both Teach and Interpret *Infallibly* (*For Truth is self can make none his Instruments, and Interpret. by them either falsely or fallibly:*) But Protestants profess themselves to be Fallible in what ever they Teach and interpret; Therefore they joyntly own themselves to be No Teaching or *interpreting Instruments* of the Holy Ghost. Observe well the Reason. This blessed Spirit when it learn's a whole Church what it is to Believe, cannot but Interpret Infallibly by those He Teaches to interpret. Our Sectaries deny this Grace of *Interpreting infallibly to All Societies of Christians*; Therefore they deny it to *Themselves*, For, they are amongst These *All*; And in doing so, They Divorce their little Company from the Infallible interpreting Spirit of the Holy Ghost. Consequently, This Spirit leaves them; *For 'tis most evident He Interprets not by such, or for such, as deny and Abjure his Infallible Interpretation.* God forbid (may Sectaries Reply) we Abjure it not, But only modestly say, We cannot Teach infallibly as he Interprets in our Harts. No. To what purpose then, doth this Divine Spirit lay up his infallible learning in your Harts, if you can never utter it, or Teach others (after your Instructions secretly received) as this Spirit speak's in you, infallibly? Here is Light indeed closely hid under a Bushel, *unseen by All, Beneficial to None*. This short Discours (can Protestants

testants discover Sophistry in it, let them speak) totally Evert's their *private spirit*, And evidences, That their Interpretation of Scripture finally comes to no more *But to a Fallacy, or a self-imagined Fancy*. All I would say here, is summoned up in these few words. *Protestants confess that they neither Teach, nor can Interpret Scripture infallibly; Therefore by their own Confession, They are neither Oracles, nor Instruments, nor Interpreters of the Holy Ghost, who Teaches and Interprets by none, when he delivers Doctrine for a whole Church, But by such as do it Infallibly.* Hence

One only
Society
that Teaches
Infallibly.

9. I say 4. *One only Society of Christians There is (Hell gates shall not prevail against it, or seduce it by Error) which Teaches and interprets the Word of God Infallibly.* This one Dove is Chast, This one Spouse is Loyal, This one Oracle is Infallible. He that Hear's it, *hear's Christ*, He who slight's it, *slight's Christ*, and draw's upon him the Malediction of a Separated *Heathen and Publican*, *Matt. 18. 17. Si Ecclesiam non audieris &c.* You do, I know, prevent my meaning; For, by this Spouse and Oracle, I understand no other, But that long standing, *Ancient, Holy, and Catholick Roman Church, which ever taught the World in foregoing Ages, before our Sectaries set footing in it.* Beside this faithful Oracle (I do demonstrate in the 1. Chap. of the next Discours) There never was, is, or shall be any thing like a *Catholick Holy Church*. Now, as it is *Ecclesia Docens*, a Church Teaching, and consists of Prelates united with one Head, *Directed by the Holy Ghost*, it Teaches and interprets Scripture infallibly. As it is *Ecclesia Discens*, or the Church Learning, it receives, and by virtue of the same blessed Spirit, both Instruction and Interpretation infallibly.

Which is
the Roman
Church.

10. The

Disc. II. C. IX. To interpret Scripture rightly. 213

10. The Truth of my Assertion stand's firm upon the undeniable Grounds already laid, no less well proved, then presupposed. Here is the summe of All. *The wise Providence of God hath left Sufficient means whereby we may know exactly the Sense of his Scripture, in matters concerning Salvation, whilst Learned men of different Sects are at endles Debates about this sense, and persist most obstinately in what they have once laid hold on. God therefore, most assuredly, will not have us run on thus in jarr's to the worlds end, and conclude nothing. There is means then of a Reconciliation afforded, if we please; But that's not Scripture alone, which cannot interpret it self, but lyes still in that ancient darknes, as it was first writ; nor can it be mans Private Iudgement, for that is both Various and Fallible. Certainly it is not the Protestants Spirit, For this we se changes every year, And, confessedly, is Destitute of the Holy Ghosts Infalible directing Spirit. It is no condemned Sect of Ancient Hareticks, acknowledged for such both by Catholicks and Protestants. Enthusiasm's no man believes, Angels interpret not Scripture. What then Remains, but that we have recours to that One, Ancient, Holy, and Univerfal Roman Church, as wel for Instruction, as Interpretation. By this sole Oracle the Holy Ghost interpret's and teacheth; or we must grant (which is lamentable) that we are turned loos into an inexplicable Labyrinth of Gods deep Secrets revealed in his Word, without hope of finding any Exit.* A summary of the precedents proofs.

11. To prove my Assertion further positively by Scripture, and the Authority of Fathers, would be both tedious to a Reader, and little avail with Sectaries (And I wave as much as may be the useles Repetition of so often quoted Authorities) who turn of Scripture by far-fetcht Glosses, and undervalue Fathers as being falli-

fallible: Yet while they do so, know well enough their own misery at home, within their breasts, which is nothing but a *spirit of Fallibility*. You find Proofs amply alleged out of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers to our present master, in our Polemical writers, chiefly when they treat of the Iudge of Controversies. However one Text, though often quoted, I will here give you. Sectaries may tamper long enough with it, before they return a probable Answer.

*A solid
proof from
Scripture.*

12. The great Apostle of the Gentiles writing to the *Ephesians* Cap. 4. after he had warned them of keeping unity in Spirit, and Faith also, *vers* 11. Add's: *And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Evangelists, and other Pastors, and Doctors &c.* And why gave he these Teachers? The following words Answer, *For the consummation of the Saints, unto the work of the Ministry, unto the edifying of the Body of Christ.* How long are these to continue? To the Worlds end, until, saith Scripture, *we meet into the unity of Faith, and knowledge of the Son of God &c.* What intention had God in establishing These *Apostles, Evangelists, and Pastors* in his Church? *That now, we be not Children fluctuating, and carried away* *περιφερόμενοι*, that is, *turned about with every wind of Doctrine, in the wickednes of men, in craftines to the circumvention of error.* Thus the Hierarchy of *Christs Teaching Church* is constituted, And by no other then Truth it self. Now I say: No Society of Christians, since *St. Paul* writ These words, can so much as probably show it self permanently blessed with an Apostolical Teacher, but our Ancient Roman Church only, where the Prince of the Apostles, *St. Peter* yet lives in every lawful succeeding Pope. No Society

*The Hierarchy of
the Church
that
Teaches.*

Disc. II. C. IX. To interpret Scripture rightly. 215

Society of Christians can lay claim to such continued *The Roman*
 Propheers as this Church hath had in it Age after Age, *Catholick*
 whether by *Propheers* we understand with Scripture 1. *Church*
Cor. 14. 1. *Holy Men praying and Prophecyng*, or such as *only shew-*
 Foretell *Future things*, our Church hath had abundance *est through*
 of these, if undoubted History may gain credit. No *every Age.*
 Society of Christians can shew so many laborious *Propheers*
Evangelists as this one Church alone; and *St. Paul* points at, *laborious*
 2. *Timot.* 4. 5. They are Those who have indefatiga- *Evange-*
 bly, through every Age without Cessation, Preached, *lists.*
 and carried *Christs* Sacred Gospel to Unconverted, and
 most remote Nations. Thus *St. Austin* sent by *St. Gre-*
 gory Pope, Anciently was an *Evangelist* to our English,
St. Boniface to the Germans, Blessed *St. Francis Xavier*
 and many other Evangelical men, were so also to the
 furthest part of the world. No Society of Christians
 But our Ancient Roman Church only, can reckon up
 so long a perpetuated Hierarchy of lawful commission- *Pastors and*
 ed Pastors, so many profound and learned Doctors, *profound*
 who labored unto Death in *Christs* Sacred Vineyard, *Learned*
 and innumerable shed their Blood in Defense of it, *Doctors.*
 These being undeniable Truths,

13. I Argue thus. This known, visible, and ne-
 ver interrupted Society of *Evangelists, Pastors, and Do-*
 ctors, This *Ecclesia Docens*, or Teaching Church, consti- *The Argu-*
 tuted by *Christ* himself, was ever, and is still Infalli- *ment.*
 ble, and, Becaus Directed by the Holy Ghost, Teaches
 and Interpret's Scripture infallibly: or, *It can err*, And
 cheat that ample Flock of Christians, committed to its
 charge, into damnable Falsties. If the first be
 granted, we have all we wish, *Viz. An infallible*
Hierarchy of living Pastors, who shall successively instruct us
infallibly.

infallibly to the worlds end. If contrarywise, this whole Hierarchy can Deceive and lead us into damnable Error, These two woful Sequels Undeniably Follow.

*Fearful Sequels from
Sectaries
fals Do-
ctrine.*

The first. That the Holy Ghost Directs not; Teach's not that living Hierarchy of Pastors, which *Christ* appointed to Teach us here on Earth; For, both This and every other Society of Christian Teachers, may Beguile us with fals Doctrin, and misinterpret Scripture? Grant so much, and it followes, 2. That our *Learned St. Paul* Mistook himself, and Uttered not one word of Truth in the place now cited. For, if these Pastors and Teachers appointed by *Christ* to Teach, and so specifically here noted, can Delude us (yea, and have *de facto* erred as Protestant Assert) 'Tis possible, That They neither comply with the Work of their Ministry, nor Edify the moral Body of *Christ* (but destroy it) nor persevere in teaching Truth, until we all meet together in a Unity of Faith (that happy day is not yet seen) nor, finally, after all Their Endeavours, Afford means to persevere steadfast in *Christs Sacred Doctrin*.

They find yet a great Part of People called *Christians*, like wilful Children resting on Self opinion only: They see them tossed and turned about with every wind of new Learning. Such is the Fault and unlucky fate of *Novellists*, who will be so wantonly Childish, as to slight an Oracle Undeceivable. Here then is the Conclusion.

The Conclusion.

The Apostles Words are True, Therefore Sectaries vent a hideous Vntruth; whilst they say, these now named Evangelists, Pastors, and Doctors may Deceive, and lead us into Error.

C H A P. X.

Objections are answered.

1. **P**erhaps they will reply : We mistake *S. Pauls* meaning ; For , the *Apostles , Euangelists , Prophets , and Doctors &c.* Wherof he speaks , are long since dead an gon ; They were those , who Preached whilst *Christ* lived on Earth , or soon after , and Teach us still by the written Word now in our Hands. Since those days we have had no Other *Euangelists . and Pastors* continued in any Christian Society , that either taught , or interpreted Infallibly . Roundly spoken ; But without book , and as *Falsly* as *fallibly*. Let Sallaries prove this gloss contrary to the express words, and bring their proof to a reserved Principle. For , who see's not the Obvious Sense of *S. Pauls* Testimony plainly perverted , whilst He points at Teachers *Successively* abiding in the Church to the Consummation *weis & Καταγενησιν* , That is , to the coagmentation of Saints , or , until they be joyned together in one Faith , and all meet in a Unity of Belief , and knowledge of the Son of God ? The Deceased Apostles now in Heaven will ('tis true) se this last Day ; But are not now with us , nor , Teach until that Consummation be. Therefore Others Succeed and teach in their Place (so God hath ordered) to the End of all things. I have Answer'd to what is added of their present Instruction by the Written Word. The Bible , I said , cannot (Because it interpret's not if self) Reconcile our Differences , And no deceased Euangelist appear's now , either to Arian or Protestant , to The written Word insufficient to reconcile **Eu** instruct ees.

218: Disc. I. C. X. *The means left by God*

instruct them when they Fail, or mistake Gods True Sense. This very Scripture therefore requires an Interpreter, in whom all must *Acquiesce*, or we may run on in endles Dissentions to the day of Judgement. But yo will ask, Who is in fault, Seing no man blames himself nor the Bible He read's? *Christ Answer's: He who hears not the Church*, is both the accused and faulty Person. And upon this Occasion I answer to a second Objection.

*Sectaries
by appeal-
ling from
the Church
to Scrip-
ture,*

*In real
Truth ap-
peal not to
Scripture,
but to
Fancy
only.*

*This in-
stance pro-
ves the
Assertion.*

2. Our adversaries may say. All Appellation from a Lower Tribunal to a Higher is lawful. And they do so: For, they Appeal from the Church (which only consists of men) to God and his Word, *the Highest Tribunal* imaginable; therefore their Procedure is blameles. I answer, It were most blameles, could They know Infallibly what God certainly faith in his Word; But this they cannot know in controverted Points, But by the Infallible Oracle of his Church. To this Tribunal *Christ* sends us for Satisfaction in all our Difficulties; If we reject or forsake this Oracle in real Truth, we appeal not to the *undoubted Sense* of Gods Word, But to our own unsteedy Sentiments, which are *Fancies* only, and nothing like Gods Word. Will you se this clearly? Imagine only a new sort of Sectaries, who will both Appeal from Church and Scripture to Gods interiour and eternall infallible knowledge of Truth: They Appeal from the Church, *Because it is made up of men*; from Scripture, *because They understand it* not in a hundred Passages. Therefore they will rely on what God knows to be True, and guess at it as well as they can. Would you not esteem such Men mad, and upon this Account, That they cannot certainly know without a Teacher, what

Disc. II. C. X. To interpret Scripture rightly. 219

this Infinite Wisdom judgeth of the Truth they seek after? This is the very case of Sectaries. *No more do they certainly know in their Principles, what God hath already Revealed in that one Text: This is my body (and the like is of innumerable others) then if he had never Registered those Words in Scripture.* They may guess at the Sense and miss, more they cannot do. Now if they tell me of no man knows what Moral Certainty, or of Fundamentals clearly enough made known in Scripture, we Answer fully to both in the next Discours.

Observe the proof.

3. They may thirdly object. If a Protestant cannot depole his Judgement, nor, think that the Church and Scripture say one thing, Because his Reason finds them Opposite to one another, He may stand for Gods Word, against the Church. To confirm this, He may tell us also, that the Church, which seem's to engross all Judicature and right of Interpreting Scripture, is no more but a Party, and a Party cannot in Reason be Iudge for it Self, when the Protestant stands out, and is in Controversy with the Church. *Here briefly is the Ground of all Heresy, and the old Plea of all Condemned Sectaries.*

An Objection containing the ground of all Heresy.

4. To Answer the first. I Ask what is this Protestant that cannot Submit his Judgement? Is he an Angel from Heaven, or one immediatly Taught by the Holy Ghost? No. He is a poor, simple, fallible, and erring Man. Why then may not he yeild to the Church, as well as his Ancestors have done before him, and the Wisest part of Christianity doth now? The true Reason is, Because he perversly will not submit, And, though he palliats his Pertinacy with a Specious Pretence of Gods Word, yet he hath not one Syl-

Is answered.

lable in Scripture for him : The most He can know (if yet so much) is, that what he reads is Scripture, but what God saith in that Scripture he cannot know at all but by Fancy only, when he judgeth contrary to the Church. O, but God Illuminates him about the Sense.

*A paradox
of Prote-
stants illu-
minated.*

Why you, my Friend, more then an Arian, as Strong in Fancy as you are ? But, why you more then a whole Ancient Church ? Doth God tender you so dearly, and not his Church ? Will he Illuminate you, and leave his Church in Darknes ? Will he give you the Spirit of Infallibility, and take it from his Church ? Away with these Trifles, not worth Refuting, neither God, nor Scripture, nor Church is here stood for, But a self-conceits only.

*And of a
whole
Church
left in
Darknes.*

*The
Church no
Party, but
Iudge.*

5. Now to what is Added of the Church being a Part, and therefore no Iudge, I'll say one Word, and first ask what is the Sectary that opposeth himself to the Church ? Is not he a Party also ? Will He then take upon him to Iudge and censure the Church, And cry out against it (as partial) if it meddle with him ? The Church is already impowred by Christ to Iudge in spiritual Causes, as I have proved ; But no Particular man is more Authorized to Iudge the Church, then a Vassal is to Iudge his sovereign after Treason committed. And the Instance is fit, as you may se ; If some in a Kingdom tumultuously rise up against both King and Country, as Sectaries have done against the Pope and Church. They are accused and brought to a Trial, before their lawful Sovereign ; the Fact is examined, whether Treasonable or no. Will these impeached Men, think ye, fly from the Judgement of their sovereign, or plead He is a Party, and therefore seek for Justice

*'Tis pro-
ved.*

to

to a *Forreign Prince*? No most certainly. The King and Country where they offend have Power to Iudge them; And so hath the Church in *Spiritual matters*, from which there can be no Appeal. And the Case is most Evident for the Church: Becaus, whilst Sectaries by their Schism or new Doctrin contrary to it, become Rebels, They have no Tribunal imaginable left them to Appeal to, secluding this Iudge, But their own self-judgement, which is the Delinquent. The Church thus rejected; Neisher God Immediately, nor Scripture more explicitly, nor Angels Ministerially judgeth for them; Therefore their last Appellation is to a very Friendly and too partial a Iudge, Their own what they Please. And this is most evident in every debated Controversy, where no other Judge is allowed of by them but Scripture (and it were well would they stand to it) But it is Scripture, as They are pleased to Interpret.

6. They may Object fourthly. Those Apostles, Prophets, Euangelists, Pastors, and Doctors mentioned in the Text, Though granted Infallible, are against all Reason supposed to be the Teachers of the Roman Church: For most surely, There were other Orthodox Teachers beside these, continued Age after Age in the world. Why therefore doth the Church of Rome draw all that's good to it self, and Allow no other Christian Society at least a share of these Doctors and Teachers &c? Mark the Objection which acknowledges a Succession of other Orthodox Pastors and Teachers in the Christian World, Age after Age, And take with it my plain Answer. If Sectaries lay claim to such, They are obliged plainly to point them out, And say where, or when they lived, who they

The Church the high Tribunal from which there is no appeal.

Sectaries make the Delinquent Iudge.

Too partial a Iudge.

The protest of other Lawfull Pastors, beside those of the Roman Catholick Church,

Shewed Null.

*A Reply
answered.*

taught &c. But they are not designable; Because, from *Luthers* days upward There were none (except the Roman Pastors) in the Christian world; But known confessed and condemned Hæreticks, And They were no Orthodox Teachers, as I largely prove in the first Chap. of the next *Discours*. Be pleased to read it. They may Reply fifthly. This Argument: *Such Pastors are not designable, therefore were not*, is purely negative and proves nothing. Well. But I hope this Proposition Asserted by Protestants. *Such Pastors and Doctors distinct from the Roman Clergy, were successively found to have been in the World, is Positive*, And therefore must be proved. However, Negative Arguments in such matters, and of the like nature with this (That is, when things are of themselves Perceptible, and yet not Seen) Are both strong and Convincing. For Example: If a company of quick sighted men stand up in a tower set before a plain, and look round about them, yet see nothing within the compas of the eye like a high Mountain; They may well conclude, There is no such Mountain within their sight. Now I say: A Church consisting of such Supposed Orthodox Pastors, as Protestants imagin, Distinct from the Roman, is as visible, and discernable as a Mountain in this present Case, Yet, were never seen by Protestants nor others. Therefore it follows They were not at all, unless we recurr to an Invisible Society of such men, now as well exploded by later Protestants, as Catholics.

Mr. Stillingfleet.

7. A fifth Objection flows from the pen of a Late Writer after this manner. *Cannot you conceive that there should be a Number of men professing Christianity, without*

out

Disc. II. C. X: To interpret Scripture rightly. 223

out Infallibility? If not (saith he) I'll help your Understanding a little. Suppose (And it's only a Supposition) That all the members of the Roman Church should be destroyed in one Age, do not you think that there would be still a number remaining, who profess Christianity of the Greek and Protestant Churches, sound at least in the Belief of Fundamentals, without Infallibility? I have answered already, No. And given my Reason: Because a Church divorced from the Infallible Assistance of the Holy Ghost, is pulled from the Center of Truth, which supports it; and consequently the Doctrine of it must needs reel and totter (now as is supposed) to rely on no firmer a Hold then on mans unsteady, fallible Reason, or on a Testimony meerly Humane, and therefore Uncertain. Neither have we without this Assistance, more Security of true Belief in Matters called Fundamental then others, As is clear in condemned Arians, who no sooner left the Church directed by this Spirit of Truth, But Errours followed them in points most Fundamental. And yet, like black Ghosts do, and will haunt them without Repentance, to the Worlds End.

A Church separated from Divine Assistance, cannot persist stable.

Without Infallible Assistance no security of Fundamentals.

8. Before we end this matter, I have one Question to propose. It is. Whether, If all the Ancient Fathers that ever lived, Had plainly interpreted Scriptures as the Roman Catholick Church now interpret's them contrary to Protestants; They would then Disavow Their own Glosses, And submit to the undeniable Authority of so many worthy Fathers? Might Reason or Religion (set one unlucky Adversary aside called Prejudice) make the Answer, Sectaries would say, Yes, And do so, were The unanimous consent of Fathers against them. Grant this much,

A Question proposed to Sectaries.

And

224 Disc. II. C. X. *The means left by God*

The Authority of a whole Church, more weighty than that of Fathers. And say boldly : The Authority of *The whole Antecedent* and this present Roman Catholick Church, is in true prudence of greater Force to withdraw Sectaries from their new invented Glosses, contrary to it, Then if all the Fathers Together Had plainly interpreted Scripture as the Church interpret's. Why? Nothing on earth can Parallel this Churches Authority, much les make it Inferiour to the universal consent of Fathers. The Reason is. These Fathers were only a part of it, particular men, and singly considered, Fallible. But a whole Church Embraceth a greater number, and cannot be misled into Error. Nay I say : Though we Impiously suppose, That this whole Church might swerve from Truth, yet the Testimony of it is as great as that of the Fathers, who, as Protestants say, may all err, and swerve more easily. This Reason is Reinforced, if we reflect on one undeniable Truth, which is : In all controversies now between us, Sectaries can pretend no more, But thus much only : That the sense of some few Fathers only (They never pretended all) whilst they interpret Scripture, is, (though often obscure) more against the Churches interpretation, then for it. Here is the most they can say with any Conscience, Though we grant not so much, when the whole Doctrine of a Father is well examined. However *Grav* Admit of the Supposition at present, And see what follows. Thus much only : The Sense of such and such Fathers is doubtful, and Sectaries say, Fallible; The Churches Sense is clear (That is, you know what it Teaches) and Though falsely supposed fallible, is yet far more firm then the other Testimony, That's confessedly both obscure and Fallible.

The Fathers only part of the Church.

Were the Church supposed Fallible the Authority of it is as great as the Fathers.

A clear Testimony, Though Fallible, hath more weight then another that's Obscure and Fallible.

9. This

Disc. II. C. X. To interpret Scripture rightly. 225

9. This Discours convinceth that Sectaries cannot impugn the Churches sense given of Scripture by any thing that hath the look of a *probable Principle*. For, the Church Defend's it self upon ~~two~~ undeniable Grounds. The first, *Positive*; And 'Tis The Churches *own Authority* (nothing can be greater) The other Negative. *Viz.* *Never any of known credit, neither Fathers generally, nor Occumenical Councils, much less, Scripture Probably,* clearly contradicted that sense which the *Roman Catholick Church Gives of Scripture*. And here by the way, You may se to what an Exigency our new men are Driven for want of Principles. They say, *The Roman Catholick Church is Fallible, The Fathers are fallible, All condemned Hareticks are fallible. They themselves are fallible.* Thus much supposed, Tell me, I beseech you, by what *probable Principle*, can They so much as seemingly shew, That either They interpret Scripture *better then we*, or, That Any of us all ever yet arrived to the *True sense* of it in controverted matters? Which yet is absolutely necessary; For, we can have no true Faith without the *true sense of Scripture*. You know, if the blind lead the blind, There is no safe conduct; And if the Fallible man Guides the Fallible, both may mistake Their way, and err grossly. You will have no Answer returned to this Difficulty, But Sectaries Fancy, and Fancy only.

10. Some may Reply. Protestants have the words of Scripture as clear as the Holy Ghost was pleased to Write them in *Fundamentals*; As also the consent of Fathers, at least for *those Fundamentals*: They wave other *By-Passages* of Scripture, and care not much whether their Interpretations be right or wrong. I Answer

If Sectaries say the more clear Church

Doctrin is, the more manifest is its Error, They speak without Principles, and suppose what is to be proved,

None of undoubted credit Ever clearly contradicted the Churches sense of Scripture.

If all are Fallible, by what Principle can Sectaries prove their Interpretation to be the best?

Or shew that Any had the true sense of Scripture? A Reply of Sectaries.

They cannot wave all Difficulties,

swer first, (To say nothing of many Others) They cannot wave one Difficulty concerning the Real presence of *Christ* in the Sacred *Eucharist*, which is either a *Fundamental Doctrine*, or none is. Both Scripture and Fathers are in this particular most expressly against them, as is proved Hereafter.

In Fundamentals we are, at least equal, and in controverted matters far superior.

11. But let this pass. I Answer 2. We have as good Scripture as Sectaries can lay claim to in every Point, which they call *Fundamental*, And with it the consent of Fathers also. In other controverted matters we own the same Scripture they own, And moreover have the sense of it Declared by this long standing Church, wherein we infinitely surpass them. *Speak therefore of matters out of controversy*, or, wherein all Agree, we are at least equal with them, And, for others in controversy, Because the Church stands for us, there can be no Competition, Unless They render our Churches *Testimony of no Force by substituting a greater in its place, For their sense, which is impossible*. Alas, They want Principles to go about such a work, And Therefore must Reduce all they talk against us to Fancy only.

No Authority Allegible contrary to the Church, can be comparable to it.

12. What I would say here, may perhaps be more clearly expressed Thus. If Sectaries have plain Scripture for Fundamentals, we have it also, and take along with it Those Fathers They Admit of. If in other Matters now in Controversy, They rely on their private judgement when they interpret Scripture, our judgement That's opposit, is (to say no more) as good as Theirs. If they plead by the *Spirit of Truth*, working in them, we might set *our spirit against theirs*, And Ask whether's better? Thus far we stand most evidently upon equal Terms with them.

Judgement against Judgement; Spirit against spirit.

Now

Now be pleased to observe what I say. They have not one plain text of Scripture, nor one plain Testimony of any Council or Ancient Father, whereby they can so much as Probably offer to Prove, That the sense of Scripture owned by Catholicks is *Erroneous* Protestants have Nothing for Their sense of Scripture but Fancy. in points debated between us, And Beside the judgement of innumerable Fathers, We have also The Authority of a whole learned Church that Approves our sense; They have neither Church, nor Scripture, nor Councils, nor Fathers for Theirs: Let therefore the world Judge, How far they are from convincing our sense of Scripture, to be erroneous by any known or received Principle, unles their Fancy enter in, and pass for a Proof, which we utterly Reject. You will say: If in all controverted matters we make so much of Church Authority, There is no Disputing Against us; For, the Church will ever stand for its own Doctrin: I answer: And, if we Value not of it so Highly, But Admit of *our Sectaries Glosses upon Their bare Word*, Why Church Authority is to be highly esteemed. We are worse then mad; when 'Tis evident, They cannot prove that sense to be erroneous by a stronger Principle Then our Church Authority is, that denies the Error. The Church Therefore fortified with most solid proofs, drawn from Scripture, Councils, Fathers, and Tradition, most justly stand's for it's own Interpretation. And hence I say: Though Cavils may be raised, *There is no Rational Disputing against it*. You have the Reason hereof already: *Because what ever Sectaries can lay hold on like a Principle*, or, That, whereby They may Attempt to prove the Catholick Interpretations fals, will Appear more then feeble to stand against The long standing Authority of this one Holy and Catholick Church. But of this subject

F f 2

more

228 Disc. II. C. X. *The means left by God*
more afterward in the following Discours.

13. And thus much of our Protestants strange unsettled Religion, And *Undeniable Apostasy*, both from Church and Scripture. We shall see in the next Discours, How They recede from Reason also. In passing, be pleased to take these few Considerations along with you.

A Recapitulation of the enormities of Protestant Religion.

14. *A Religion destitute of all Appearance of any Ancient Church to side and symbolize with*, As Protestants most evidently are: (Their Recours to the third or fourth first Ages, is *Ignotum per ignotius*, and no less and *Unproved*, then a Supposed whimsy) *A Religion which hath not one syllable of Scripture for it*, as 'tis evident men of this Profession have not, And because they ever glory in Scripture-proof, I am forced to tell them, They cannot produce one text for Protestantism without Their fallible Glosses (if I wrong their cause let them speak out, and shame me, I'll suffer the Affront, yet fear it not: But Remember I call for plain Scripture.) *A Religion which never yet had one General Council to Confirm it*, no *Universal Tradition to Warrant it*, not one Professor before Luther to own it. *A Religion which holds the Belief of all Christians to have been False for a thousand years together*, And the Prelates misled by Error, who taught Christians for so vast a time. *A Religion, whose Professors take upon them to Reform others, Before They find Their own pretended Reformation arriv'd to any Shadow of Perfection*; who spy errors in a Church never Discovered Erroneous, By Thousands more Ancient and Learned then They. *A Religion which hath the very look of Heresy* (turn is which way you will) which opposeth all men, And is opposed by the Rest of Christians; which is settled on no other Ground, But the bare *Unproved Word* of those *Uncommissioned*

Disc. II. C. X. To interpret Scripture rightly. 229

ned Men that Teach it; which Changes every year, and hath no seeming Principle for a Ground of Constancy; not one Motive to make it Rationally credible. Such a Religion, I say, Dishonors God, Injures Jesus Christ, seduceth poor Souls, and as unworthily, as weakly, stands out against that Ancient Roman Catholick Church; which is every way Blamles, unless faulty in This, that it made Protestants Their Progenitors, And the Rest of the world Christians. If I here overlash in Asserting too much, let our Adversaries come closely to any one Particular, and vouchsafe fairly, and rationally, to make my Errour known.



Ff3

THE

T H E THIRD DISCOVERS O F

The Vnreasonable Proceeding of Protestants in some chief Handled Points of Controversy.

Be pleased to observe what I shall Note Hereafter. You shall ever find our Sectaries either sculking in Generalities, or supposing what is to be proved, or wording it by Scripture misinterpreted, or finally making Controversies endles, without Appealing to any other Iudge, but Themselves.

THE

THE FIRST CHAPTER.

*Protestants are Unreasonable, whilst They
seemingly hold a Catholick Church
Distinct from the Roman, neither
known nor Designable by any.*

THis is an Article of the Apostles Creed: *I believe the Holy Catholick Church*, And was so three dayes before *Luther* deserted the Roman Faith. My humble sute is, That our New Men will pleas by a plain *Designation* (I ask not for a Definition of the Church) to point me out the True Church, which then *was* (or now is) *Holy*, and *Catholick*. Protestants, as I here suppose, were not then visible in the world. There were ('Tis true) *Arians*, *Pelagians*, *Abyssinians*, *Græcians*, And perhaps some Remainder of *Donatists* with other Hæreticks (whether more or fewer it import's not to our present Question.) Notwithstanding it is evident, That some Christians then living, unanimously Professed Their Belief in a *Holy Catholick Church*. My demand therefore is; whether, That Believed Article was then True or Fals? If fals, for want of a true Catholick Church, Speak out plainly, And say that Christians Believed a Church, which then Really was not in Being. If True. The then *Holy Catholick Church*, which Verified the Belief of that

*Selfaries
are requi-
red to point
at a Catho-
lick Church
before Lu-
ther.*

*Known
Hæreticks
constituted
not the Catho-
lick Church,
yet the Ar-
ticle of our
Creed was
then true.*

Not Pa-
pists ac-
cording to
Protestants,
nor the la-
ter Gra-
ecians.

None say
Se-
ctarians,
but gross
erring men
were in the
world befo-
re Luther.

Protestants
only are not
the Holy
Universal
Church.

The Que-
stion propo-
sed deserves
a clear
Answer.

An abstract
business
Christ in-
sufficient to
constitute
true Catho-
lick Faith.

that Article, can be plainly and without fumbling De-
signed. Say then, on Gods name, what Christians
had we, who constituted the Holy Catholick Church
in Those Dayes? Papists, you say, were all in a
Deluge of Errour, which made Luther to leave them.
Our later Graecians held, and hold still, a True *Mass*,
Sacrifice, the *Real Presence*, *Praying to Saints*, *Prayers for*
the Dead &c. They therefore, contrary to our Se-
ctaries, were neither the Holy nor Vniversal Church;
Much les were *Arians*, *Abyssins*, *Pelagians*, *Monothe-
lits*, or all of them together. Now besides such er-
ring men, There were no other in the World. If
Therefore the Vniversal Church be Essentially made up
of Particular Churches, as truly it is: (For there is no
Vniversale à parte rei) And all Particular Churches Na-
meable in those dayes, grossly Erred; it follows evident-
ly, That then no Holy Catholick Church could be Belie-

ved. Since Those times Our Protestants came in,
And will They, (if That Article of our Creed was
Fals in the last Age) verify it now, and stile Them-
selves the only Vniversal Church? I am Confident They
will not *Donatize* so far, or dare to do so. The Que-
stion Therefore Proposed deserves an exact Answer.

*Viz. Where, or amongst what Christians shall we find the
Holy Vniversal Church, Then free from notable Errour?*

2. Can our Novellists Rationally say, That All tho-
se who rightly Believed in *Christ* constituted the Holy
Vniversal Church? If so, The Reply is too general;
and we ask again, Who Those were, and urge to
have the Particular Communities Specified, That Ca-
tholickly Believed in *Christ*? We demand moreover,
what they mean by that Belief in *Christ*, Was it enough
to

Disc. III. C. I. *Unreasonable Proceeding.* 233

to Confes Him to be the True *Messias*, Our Redeemer, our Master, or, to acknowledge his Death, his Resurrection; *without Believing more of his Doctrin?* Surely *More is required and necessary to Salvation.* no. For, first God never spake those other Excellent Verities registred in Scripture (whether *Dogmatical* or *relating* to manners) in-vain, But to good Purpose, And with Intention That They should (besides that abstracted Faith in *Christ*) both be harken'd to, and Believed, after a Sufficient Proposal. Again: Were the later Gracians, who firmly Believed in *Christ*, and held never the les Almost all the Tenents of the Roman Catholick Church, Catholick Believers also? If so. Papists can in no Iustice be excluded from that Communion. Perhaps you will say, you do not exclude them. No. Why then have you hanged them upon Gibbets, meerly for being *Papists*? If you Answer, you do so upon the Account of their Particular Errors, then hang up a number of your own Ministers, who confessedly have more Errors among them; Or, if petty Differences in Points of Faith, may be pardoned in the One, why are they so severely punished in the Other? But *ad rem*,

3. Say plainly, And Answer Categorically without Shuffling. Were *Arians*, *Pelagians*, *Nestorians*, *Monothelists*, Parts and Members of the Holy Catholick Church; For they believed in *Christ*, and owned him for their Redeemer, Master and Doctor, yea, and admitted of Scripture also? If you Affirm it; Then there never were, nor can be Heresies in the Christian world, whilst *Christ* is acknowledged in this General Way, and consequently, the Ancient Councils Dealt most unjustly with these men in casting them out *Arians and Pelagians believed in Christ, yet were cast out of the Church as Hereticks.*

A Church
compound-
ed of his-
torious dis-
senting
Members
is not
Christs
Church.

No Doctri-
ne peculiar
to Sectaries
can be Ca-
tholick.

Protestants
cannot an-
swer the
Question.

The first
Answer
refused.

of the Churches Communion, And proclaiming them He-
reticks. Beside observe, I pray you, what a pretty
Church is here, made up of men irreconcilable in
their Disputes. Is this think ye, that Holy, Uni-
versal, and United Society of Christians, which Christ
Jesus cimented together in one Faith, who do nothing
but clash one with another? And will he own this
for his Spouse, when he comes to Iudge the World?
Yet farther. No Doctrin proper to Particular Secta-
ries, as *Arianism* is to *Arians*, *Pelagianism* to *Pelagians*,
Protestantism to *Protestants*, can (Beaus-bound up with-
in the narrow compass of these Communities) deser-
ve the Name, or *Notion* of either Holy, Universal, or
Catholick Doctrin. Prescind therefore from these par-
ticular Doctrins, or lay them aside (which, as Prote-
stants must say, did not *Knchurch* them) my Demand
is (and it shall never be Answered) wherein Consists the
Remainder of that Doctrin, which implies the pure Essentials
of Christian Religion; joyns men together in one Faith, and
makes them true members of the Holy and Universal Church?

4. Will You hear, as I think, the best Answer of
some newer Protestants? They may say: *Who ever*
Believes in Christ and Scripture, and joyns in that Belief,
which was Universally owned by the whole Christian World be-
fore Luther, is right in Faith, and a Member of the Holy
Universal Church, Though, perhaps, He Believes, with
his tainted Church, some Errours. A most wret-
ched and unproved Assertion. For, who, ever yet
maintain'd; That a Society of Christians, owning
some Doctrin True (as all have don) and more perhaps
Fals, is a part of the True Holy Catholick Church?
We say, *Bonum ex integrâ causâ, malum ex quolibet defe-*

ctu :

Disc. III. C. I. *Unreasonable Proceeding.* 235

Elm: A Faith Therefore Truly good, is Intierly good, Any *Falsity Spoil's it*, And then most, when 'Tis vitiated with notable Errours. Tell me, if Scripture were Corrupted in some Points of Consequence; would you own the whole Bible for Gods Word? No certainly. How then can we own That for Christs True Church, which is corrupted with Fals Doctrin? You will say: We must take the Good without the Bad, And Believe as much as is necessary to the Essential Being of a Church, And that makes us Catholics, Though we joyntly Believe some errors with it. Answer. This is worse then before, And more confused stuff. Who are those WE, that can chuse thus; Or, Tell me, if I live in an Erring Church, where Fals Doctrin is Secretly mingled with Truth; what I am to chuse, or, what is Good or Bad? If a poor simple man, Deceived by his Pastor, fall into an Errour, There are others ready to unbeguile him; But here are none to do this Service, Because none can certainly Judge of the right or wrong. Will you say, That Scripture is to decide in such Doubts? Pray you Tell me, if (by a supposed Impossibility) Scripture it self were Corrupted in certain great matters, And no Body knew where, on whose Judgement should we Rely to single out those Corruptions? This Case only supposed, is a Real one in the Churches Before Luther (if the Roman fail us;) For all other were corrupted, and no Protestant can certainly say in what. However, Take Scripture, as it is most pure, And plead with it against an Arian, He laughs at you, and says he hath more clear Scripture for his Particular Tenents, then Protestants have for theirs. What

A Church vitiated with gross errors is no more a Church. Then the Bible notably corrupted is Gods Word.

None can separate Truth from falshood, if I live in an Erring Church, Because He who endeavours to unbeguile me, may be himself.

Neither Scripture nor mans own private judgement can help in such an Exigency.

then is next? Every Private man must in such Exigencies Judge for himself. The *Arian* Answers He doth so, And thinks his Judgement as good as yours, yet still remain's in his Errour. Well, at last you shall hear the right Solution.

C H A P. II.

Of a late VVriters Doctrin.

*Mr. Still-
ingfleet,*

*A second
Answer
refuted.*

*These men
propose im-
possibili-
ties.*

1. **W**Hen all Christian Societies (saith he) consent to such things, as by the Judgement of all those Societies, are necessary to the Being of the Catholick Church, Then we are Right in Faith: And this Judgement is best made, when we regulate our Belief by the Catholick Doctrin of the first Ages. Here is, no man knows what, and not only a Generality, But Impossibility upon Impossibility. Say therefore. Shall we ever see that day, when all Christian Societies will stand thus United in one Judgement concerning the Being, or the Essentials of a Church? Never. Unles every Particular Society first lay down its own supposed Errour, and say: So much is not essentially necessary. 2. Do you think, That Catholicks will ever come in, And acknowledge either Their Belief of an *Vnbloody Sacrifice* or *Transubstantiation* to be errours? No. They hold these Doctrins as Essential, as to Believe a Trinity. Do you Think that *Arians*, *Pelagians*, and other *Hereticks*, will so far Disown their Particular Tenents, as to lay them down, or grant They make not up a Church? No certainly. This Consent of Judgements

ments Therefore, in all Christians Societies, for the owning of so much precisely as is Necessary to the Essential Being of a Church, is a most unlearned Speculation. Neither do we mend the matter, in saying as some do, That nothing is Essential to a Church, *But what may be Evidently propounded to all Persons, as a Thing whereof God requires Explicit Belief.* For, upon whole Proposition made evident to us, may we *Assuredly* rest, and Hold That God requires an Explicit Belief of so many Articles, *and no more?* If you answer, 'Tis so much as The Catholick Church in all Ages received, you still lurk in Darknes, And prove *ignotum per ignotum*; For you never yet told us, nor can tell us, where this Catholick Church is, or what it Taught. You will say it is That Church, or there agreed on Doctrin, which all, who went under the Notion of Christians, owned as *Holy and catholick.* Answ. There never was any such Church; nor such Doctrin owned by all in the World: For *Christs* True Doctrin always met with opposition, and had Fals Doctrin against it. You will say the Primitive Church and Doctrin was pure, let us stick to That, And all is well. I answer first: It was most pure, yet both *Arians* and others opposed it. They therefore will not Agree to it. And here by the way I might Ask, Why their Authority was not then every whit as good, to *Uncatholick* that first Church, as *Sectaries* is now to *Uncatholick* the Roman. 2. It is a meer Subterfuge, Thus to run up to the Primitive Church, whilst you and we Agree not (though tis your Fault) what that Ancient Church Taught in many Particulars. If you say, We must read, and judge.

The supposed consent of Iudgements for owning so much precise Doctrin Essential is a *Chimera*; *Sectaries* cannot propound that precise Doctrin whereof God requires explicit Belief.

Arians opposed as much the Ancient.

As Protestants do the Primitive Church.

judge. Alas! We have All been Reading these hundred years, And yet are at Variance about that Doctrin. You se then how Controversies are made Endles, by this Proceeding. But what will yet It is an old Fallacy of our New men, who first suppose, And then go on to Prove. They suppose the Primitive Doctrin to be known and agreed on by Themselves and Us, and then Appeal to it. There is no such thing. The Real Truth therefore is. They take up shelter here, Becaus Controversies that are now most handled, were in Those days the least examined.

Why Sectaries recur to the primitive Church.

2. Some of our Later men may perhaps pretend That we have not been able hitherto to understand their meaning, or to dive into the Speculative Conceits of the Church Catholick, And therefore teach us thus. That Doctrin wherein all Churches have Agreed on, ever since Christs time, can be no matter of Discord; for where all Agree, there can be no Disagreement. Take therefore that Precise and Uniform Doctrin which all Christians have (Antecedently to particular errors) Universally owned, as unquestioned Christian Doctrin, Therin consists the Essentials of Saving Faith, or the very Quintessence of the Catholick Church, and in no more.

A third Answer refused.

The abstracting true Doctrin from falsity a speculation worth doing.

3. Mark well a strong Speculation about nothing. You must Preseind one Uniform, Univocal, True Religion, from all Fals Religions in the World, And then you have the True Religion. That is, you must cut of from Arianism, from Pelagianism, from Donatism, from Protestantism, from Popery (For here is also some thing supposed Amis) what is Errour. And the Remainder of Doctrin, wherein all Agree, constitutes the Essence of Saving Faith.

Faith. Believe it, it will prove a mighty Difficulty, to cut and carve right in so Weighty a matter. Pray you, who must Go above this work? *Protestants ought first to lay down their own Errors.* Protestants? Toyes. Let them on Gods name, who are so much upon Reformation, first lead the way, and lay down their own Errors, next we shall see who follows them. I am sure Catholicks will not Disown the least Article of their Belief; For they, as I told you just now, Assent with *equal Assurance*, to all Points of Faith. And so do also, I think, The Arians and *Catholicks will abate Nothing of their Belief.* other Sectaries to their Particular Errors. But suppose, That we mentally conceive one agreed-on Harmonious Doctrin, *Admit of the supposition nothing is concluded.* Universally held by all Christians, who can Assure me, that so much precisely is enough for Saving Faith? You may say, that, That Doctrin wherin all Christians Agree, cannot but be True, Becaus all own it: *But, you shall never see much as probably show, That saving Faith requires no more, or, stand's safe upon such a Generality.* The Arians believed in Christ, that is General Doctrin, But denyed his God-head. Cerinthus and Ebion Believed in Christ, But held that he was Man only. The Monothelites Believed in Christ, But denyed his *two Natures*, his two Wills Humane, and Divine. The Apollinarians Believed in Christ, and held that the Word assumed True Flesh, But without a *Created Soul*. Tell me now, can you Abstract a Belief from these Erring Christians, Common to all other, That is, *safe, sufficient, and enough Faith.* to constitute Saving and Catholick Faith? Is it enough to say, I do Believe in Christ, without descending with my Faith, to an explicit Belief of his Divinity also? Hath one that saith, I believe in Christ; But I will abstract

240 Disc. III. C. II. *Of a late VVriters Doctrin.*

Plain Ha-
rassy follows
from these
Sectaries
Doctrin.

Abstract from a Belief of his *two Natures*, from his *having a Rational-Soul*; from His *Being God and Man*? And Becaus others have positively Disbelieved these Articles, I will only *Prescind* from the Verity of them (to prescind is les, then expressly to deny them) hath such an one, I say, Saving Faith enough to make him a Member of the Holy Catholick Church? No. For if so, He needs not to believe at all the Divinity of *Christ*, or his *two Natures*; after Scripture is Red, and Proposed unto him, which obligeth him, if He own it for Gods Word, not to Abstract from the Belief of these Articles, *But positively to yeild an Assent to them with True Faith, as most Fundamental Verities of Christian Religion.* You se Therefore, how Impossible it is to draw one true *Uniform, yniversal Doctrin, From all erring Christians*, And to hold that, on the *one side* sufficient for Catholick Faith; *And on the other*, to comply with that strict Obligation which expresse Scripture (clearly proposed) forceth us to Believe.

Protestants
ought to
acknowledg
the Roman
Catholick
Church as
True &c.

4. This Point I insist on, Becaus I know, Protestants cannot so much as probably Name any Thing like a *Holy united catholick Church before Luther*; unles, They *first* Answer (as some of them seem to do) by the Abstract Doctrin of all Christians, now evidenced no Faith, And say, That particular Errors did Vn-catholick none. Or, Secondly run to an invisible Church, not at all *Designable*. Or, thirdly (as They ought to do) Acknowledge that the Roman Catholick Church was then, and now is, not only a Church, But the *sole, Holy, and Catholick Church of Christ through the whole World*. With this Catholick Sociëty, I could show (were it not amply don by others) How
all

Disc. III. C. II. Of a late VVriters Doctrin. 241

all, who Age after Age merited the Name of Catholicks, have ioyned in Faith, And all, who parted from it, Have been *Branded* with the ignominious Note of *Hereticks*. If I speak not Truth, Name any Society of Christians before *Luther*, That ever gained the Repute of Catholick, But such only as were United in Faith with the Roman Church? Name any one Society That Divorced it Self from this Church which Forthwith lost not that *Ancient Title* of Catholick, Or, was not upon That Separation, Stiled *Heretical, Schismatical*, or Both. If you say first, the Roman Church wronged them; I Ask. *Quis se constituit iudicem?* Who made you judge in this Case? Name the injured Parties. Were the *Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, Donatists* wronged, when they left Communion with this Church? No. But the *Waldenses, the Albigenfes, the Hussites*, And most of all, The later *Gracians* had Injury Don them. And why so more Then *Pelagians*? Is your bare Assertion Proof enough to Declare Those Guilty, and These Innocent? When you, your selves, as much condemn them as Catholicks Do, For You utterly Disavow Their Doctrin. Was ever General Council Convened, That did more Patronize the Error of these *Waldenses*, Then those other of the *Arians*, or, *That blamed the Roman Church, for casting them out of Her Communion?* No. Why therefore do you Plead so much, for a Bad cause, when you have no more to Defend it, Then your own Proofles Talk; which Had you spent in an Apology For any Old Condemned *Heretick*, would have Help't as much (That's nothing at all) as now you Advantage These later Men? And Observe, I Beseech you, How weakly

Hh you

Or can find none.

None ever had the Name of Catholick but those of the Roman Faith.

The Gracians, Waldenses &c. No more wronged then Arians.

Seſſaries
plead for
condemned
Hæreticks
without
any Prin-
ciple but
their own
Talk.

And make
Controver-
ſies Endles.

They De-
fend Do-
ctrin de-
nyed by the
English
Church.

Gracians,
Huſſits, and
Waldenſes
could not
make the
Catholick
Church.

you, Go to work, You ſay, the *Huſſits, Waldenſes,* and Others were good Catholicks. We deny it. And Demonſtrate their *Vncatholick Doctrin*. To what Tribunal ſhall we Appeal for a juſt Sentence to your Saying, *Yes* or to our, *No*. To *None*? And Thus you Proceed with us in all your Controverſies. We muſt either take your Word for your Assertion, or Diſpute without end upon nothing that hath the Appearance of a received Principle.

5. You Say Again. The Later *Gracians* were Catholicks, Before they Reganted their Errours in the Council of Florence. How Prove you That? By a glorious Empty Title: *A Defence of the Greek Church, By Far-fetch'd, Uncertain Conjectures, And meer Negative Arguments*, which are ſo ſlight, That if all were put together in a juſt Ballance, They would not weigh one Straw, much leſs Out-weigh the Definition of a moſt Learned General Council againſt the Greeks, Yet ſuch Talk, and Talk only lengthen's theſe new Books. And makes them ſo Voluminous as They are. And by the way Note here a Pretty Humour. *The Greeks muſt be Defended in that Point of the Holy Ghaſts Proceſſion from the Father Only*, whiſt the Church of England Anathematizes the Doctrin. Is not this Right, think ye, And well done by a Proteſtant?

6. Well. You ſhall ſe my plain Dealing with you. I Licence you to take Theſe *Gracians*, Thoſe *Huſſits*, Thoſe *Waldenſes* &c. to make up a Church before Luther, yet muſt Tell you, They Do not the deed without more Company, which cannot be found. That Theſe we have named, make not the Church Catholick, is Evident: For, firſt they were never
Univer-

Univerſal, either in Time or Place. Their late *Beginnings*, and little *Extent*, are known and upon Record. 2. They were never United in one Doctrin, But more at variance with One another, Then you and Catholics are, This they only Agreed in to Oppose the Catholick Faith; And if ſo much made them *Proteſtants*, or good Catholics, You may call in *Turks* and *Jews* to hear them Company. 3. They were moſt contrary to Proteſtant Religion, and not in Trifles only. Why therefore have you recourſe to a People ſo Blaſted, Scattered, and almoſt now Forgotten? Alas, The Reason is clear: *Becauſe without them you have nothing to make a Church of, And yet with them you are Churchleſs.* I ſay therefore. No Roman Catholick Church, no Church at all. If no Church at all, There was then no Truth in that Article of Our Creed. I Believe the Holy Catholick Church. To Evidence further what I now Aſſert. Do no more, But Forget, as it were, or, caſt out of your mind all Thought of Roman Catholics, from Luther upward to the fourth Age. Then Look About you, And Conſider well the Remainder of other Chriſtians For that Vaſt Interval of Time; You will find none but Profeſſed Hareticks, Schiſmaticks, or Both, as *Arians*, *Neflorians*, *Pelagians*, and ſuch a like Rabble of men. Again: Forget theſe, as much as if They had never Been, And only Think of the Roman Catholick Church, *Diffuſed the whole World over, continued Age after Age;* Will you not have a Holy, and Univerſal Church Preſented to your Thoughts? Yea moſt aſſuredly, And a Glorious Church too. It is therefore Evident, That the Roman Catholick Society, was not only Neceſſary to make up the Church, But was Moreover the

Proteſtants
Every way
Churchleſs.

No Roman
Catholick
Church, no
Church at
all.

Excludes
the Roman
Catholick
Church.
Hareticks
only re-
main.

Excludes
Hareticks,
you yet
have a
glorious
Church.

244 Disc. III. C. III. *More of Protestants*
Sole, and only Essential Church of Christ, as I have already Proved.

C H A P. III.

*The Pretended Reformation of Protestants is Unreasonable, if Faith in Christ Only Suffice for Salvation.
A more Explicit Faith is proved Necessary.*

I. **I** Must Needs have a Word more with our Adversaries upon this Subject, and Note : That if a General Belief in *Christs Sacred Person, Office, and Dignity*, be Saving Faith enough for a Christian, which some endeavour to Prove by that Text of *St. Iohn 20. 31. And these Things are written, That ye might Believe that Iesus is the Christ the Son of God, And that believing ye might have life in his Name.* If such a General Faith, I say, makes us all, as well Catholicks, as Christians, without more ; Our Protestants need not to storm at us as They do, for want of True Faith ; For we Catholicks Agree and Believe in *Christ, God, and Man*, as firmly as They do ; And in this one Article only (may we credit them) All Necessary Essentials of Christian Faith are included. It is true, Catholicks say, a more Explicit Faith is required, as I shall presently

Disc.II.C.III. *Vnreasonable Proceeding.* 245

ly Declare; But Protestants, who do not, May rest contented; And withall confesse, That the great Coyle They have kept in Reforming Catholick Doctrin comes to no more, But to a slight Piddling about *Non-Essentials*, which, for ought is yet known, *Hath done more hurt then good, And made Things worse then They were Before.*

Protestants slight worse about things not Essentials, May have done more hurt then Good.

2. To Drive the Difficulty home; I Ask seriously, Whether any one Article Peculiar to this Religion, as *Protestancy* (That is beside the General Belief in *Christ*, and owning Scripture &c.) Be necessary to Salvation? If yes; Then will *Arians, Pelagians, Donatists*, and other Sectaries say also; what they hold Particular is also Necessary. And Therefore Doctrin Above, or Beyond the Belief in *Christ*, or, not *Vniversal*, is of like *Necessity*. If Protestants answer, No; or, Assert that nothing Particularly held by them (because not *Vniversal Catholick Doctrin*) implies this Necessity, But a Belief in *Christ* only. Two things follow. The One is, as I have now Noted, That, without Fruit at all, They have made a shamfull stir with their *Schism* in Blustering all this while about *non-Essentials* and petty Differences, which may be Believed or Not, without Danger of loosing Salvation. 2. It follows, That, as Protestants here Acknowledge, a Church so *Vniversal*, wherein all may be Saved that Believe in *Christ*, in like manner, Any one, and upon as good Reason, May make it Wider, and allow Salvation to all, whether *Jews* or *Turks*, that Believe in God only, without Explicit Faith in *Christ*, *Vnus Deus, Vna Fides*. Therefore, in Place of *Christs Church* we may have a Gods *Church*, more large and ample erected in the world.

If Protestants hold their particular Doctrin necessary to Salvation, other Hereticks will pretend the like.

And if not, two strange Sequels undeniably follow.

A large Church must be allowed of by Protestants.

H h 3

3. You

More necessary to Salvation than Belief in Christ only.

The Belief of Sacraments necessary.

And of other Moral Doctrines.

3. You will say, Scripture is most Evident for a Belief in *Christ*; Might a *Defender* of the now large Imagined Church (which affords Salvation to all that Believe in God) Answer, He would tell you, That the Explicit Belief in God *implies some kind of Implicite Belief in Christ*, And that is enough, which He is ready to Make good, when you have proved your *Abstract Faith in Christs sacred Person* to be Sufficient to Salvation. A better Answer is, Scripture most Certainly Obligeth us to Believe in *Christ* Explicitly; But doth it leave of there, and not joyntly oblige us to Believe other Articles also Explicitly, when they are plain in Scripture, And sufficiently proposed? Such are the Sacraments of *Baptism* and *the Holy Eucharist* &c. Can we therefore, after we Own these Truths Delivered in Gods Word, hope for Salvation without an explicit Belief of them? If so, *St. John* c. 6. 53. saith not True: *Unles ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you have no Life in you.* Surely we cannot do this *like Christians*, Unles we believe it. If no; The Belief of these Sacraments constitute the Essentials of Saving Faith, and so doth also the Belief of much Moral Doctrin set down in Scripture. Read what *St. Paul* Writes *Cor. 1. 6. 9.* concerning the *Unrighteous, Idolaters, and Fornicators* &c. And tell me, if you Own Gods Word, whether the Apostle doth not Disinherit all *Unbelievers* of his Doctrin? Therefore something more is Necessary for Christians, united in one Faith, to Assent to, Then only to Believe in *Christ*.

4. The true Fundamental Ground of my Assertion is This: *Whatever God speaks in Scripture* (who never spake

(spake Idle word) *whether the Matter may seem to our weak Capacities little or great*, is, after a Sufficient Proposal, of the same Weight and Authority. To Believe therefore in *Christs* is a Fundamental Article, and (in one Sence Known to every One) *most Fundamental*; But to Reject, or Abstract from His *other Verities* Revealed in Scripture, or to make les Reckoning of them, Because they Appear little to us, is to *Affront God*, And Tell him, That we will Believe him so far as we pleas, But no farther, Whereas on the contrary side he Assures us, That his Word is *equally engaged* in all He Saith, 'And that his Eternal Truths, whether little or great, are not to be Valued of by *what is spoken*, But by the *certain Authority of him that speak's* them. Hence Divins Assert, and most Truly, That no man can Believe so much as one Article of Christian Faith upon the Motive of *Gods Revealed Testimony*, unless He readily Embrace All other alike, as equally Proposed, upon the same Authority. For where we have the Same Motive, we must yeild the Same Assent, and with like Reverence. Upon this Motive of *Gods Revealing Word*, True Christian Faith Relies, *Mille Chypei pendentes ex ea, omnis armatura fortium*, Here they meet together, Centred, as it were, in This One *Vndecieved*, and *Vndecieving Verity*. Do I therefore Believe *Christ* to be the True *Messias*, Because God saith it? I must also Believe Baptism, the Eucharist, and other Revealed Truths, when after a sufficient Proposal, I know, *That the same God speak's Them*. For if his Word Prevail with me to Credit him in the one, It is as Powerful and pressing to force, as I may say, Faith from me in the Other. A further Reason is: *Because a Another right Reason*.

All Truths in Scripture are of equal Authority.

The Center of Faith,

We Believe all alike upon Gods Word.

248 Disc. III. C. III. *More of Protestants*

right Act of Faith, sealed on this Motive, is a virtual and Implicit Belief, not of one Article. But of all other which the Motive Own's, or Uphold's. You see therefore, none can truly Believe in Christ, who Denies the least Verity (Sufficiently proposed) that God Reveals: For,

Believe all, or none at all,

as the True Belief of one Article implies a Belief of All, so the Denial of One, implies a Denial of all Other. And thus Christian Faith consists in INDIVISIBILI, And is either Wholly had, or Wholly lost, which is the True cause why Protestants have no Faith, And must humble as They do in Their Doctrin concerning the Essentials of it; And finally have never yet discover'd, nor shall hereafter (if we seclude the Roman) Any Thing like a Catholick Church before Luther.

Why Protestants have no Faith and stagger in their Doctrin concerning fundamentals.

5. For These Reasons now alleged, Perhaps Some will say, That, After a Belief in *Christ*, and a General owning of Scripture, we must Descend to more Particulars, And explicitly Assent to all that Express Scripture plainly Delivers (And we will Adhere to the very Words) without Dispute. If we do so, We Admit of all That God clearly Reveal's, and Take it upon his Authority without Interpretation.

A Reply to little purpose.

Answer. Here is a fair Promise of Nothing; For who can Assure us, without Dispute, when Scripture speaks plainly? Both Catholicks and Protestants Dissent in this very Principle. Those say it Speak's plainly for the Real Presence of *Christ's Sacred Body* in the Eucharist, For Remission of Sins by a Priest, For Justification by Good Works, For Extream-Vnction, For the Infallibility of the Church &c. These Deny all, And (do what we can to hinder them) will upon their own Fancies Force into Gods Word certain violent

Who can tell when Scripture speaks plainly?

The matter still in dispute.

Glof.

Glosses, which God never Spake. You se Therefore, That, when we Descend to the Particular Expressions of Scripture Concerning the Particular Doctrins of it, we are at a stand, and cannot go forward; For Sectaries will have no Judge on Earth to Appeal to in These Doubts. If they say the Ancient Church shall Judge. We are, as I told you, as Far from Home as Before, And as much Differ about the Sentiments of that Church, as we do about the Sense of Scripture. And thus it ever fall's out; Either we must Drive Controversies Between us to Endles Quarrels, or, yeild to what our Protestants say, or Finally Commiserate their sad Condition, Becaus they will not Acquiesce in a Judge upon Earth, that as well Ascertain's us of the Meaning, as it doth of the very Books of Scripture. Without this Judge we may contract to the Worlds End, and never be Wiser.

A Judge necessary to determine &c.

Otherwise Controversies are Endles.

6. You se this plainly in that Instance Proposed above out of *S. Hierom.* For, according to plain Scripture, *if one strike us on the right cheek, we must Turn to him the other also.* We are to Abstain from eating of Blood and Things strangled: We are not to have two Coats nor carry Money with us &c. None can Deny But that God Speaks These Verities, Although they seem light to us; Buthow to understand them, is to be learned from some Infallible Interpreter of Scripture (which Protestants Reject) when all know that very often, where Scripture seem's Clear in Words, There it is more deep in Sense, and most Obscure.

Scripture obscure when seemingly Clear in Words,

C H A P. IV.

The Ambiguous Discourses of Protestants, concerning Fundamentals in Faith, are Proved Unreasonable.

1. **W**E need not here to Discuss too largely This Point of Fundamentals (most Learnedly examined by Catholick Writers) For if we Reflect well on what is Proved in the precedent Chapter, There is enough said to Silence All Adversaries, and to satisfy every Rational Mans doubts in This Question.

The Catholick Doctrine.

2. We Catholicks Speak plainly, and Assert. Although an Explicit Belief in God, as a *Rewarder of Good* and a *Punisher of Evil* (yea, as some Divines hold of *Christ* also, After the Promulgation of the Gospel) Be *Primary Fundamental Points of Faith*, *Beaus* (*Necessitate medij*) Every one is obliged to Believe Them Explicitly; Yet withall we say, That the Least Article Revealed by Almighty God, when it is Sufficiently Proposed, grows to be so far Fundamental, That none can Deny or Doubt of it, without Damnable Sin. And in this Sense there is no Distinction between Points Fundamental, and not Fundamental. The reason here-

What ever God Reveals, is equally to be believ'd.

of (Already given) Relies upon this Certain Principle. *What God Speaks, whether the Material Object be little or great, After the Charge laid on us to Believe, is to be Admitted*

Disc.III.C.IV. *Fundamentals, Vnreasonable.* 251

mitted of with equal Certitude and Reverence: For, it is not
 The less or more Weights of Things Revealed, That distinguishes
 our Faith, or makes it less or more Valuable; But, that Submission to Gods
 which sets the true Price upon it, is the Submission we yeild Veracity
 by it to Gods Veracity. Now because this Veracity gives true
 is one and equally the same in what ever is Revealed, value to
 By consequence we Say, That Faith upon the Ac- Faith.
 count of that Submission is equally Good, Solid, and
 Valuable. This I Note in Opposition, to Sectaries,
 Who, For ought I can yet learn, Measure their Faith, Faith not
 not so much By the Excellency of the FORMAL OBJECT, as to be mea-
 by the different Nature of Things Revealed: Which, Be- sured by
 caus considered in themselves, They often vary in the Diver-
 worth; Protestants Think, that the Degrees of their sity of
 Faith may answerably be less or more various, ac- things re-
 cording as the Object requires. It is an Error. vealed.
 For, as it is certain, That when God Speaks to us, The The Rea-
 Highest Truth imaginable speaks; so it is as certain, That son.
 He is to be Heard by us with Highest Respect and Reverence,
 whether the Matter be great or Small.

3. What is here said, supposeth a Sufficient Pro-
 position of Revealed Verities, which without doubt
 are not equally Clear to all Capacities, if we Descend
 to the Explicit Belief of particular Mysteries; But
 this is no hindrance to Catholick Faith in the most How the
 unlearned man in the World; For such an one Belie- unlearned
 ves Explicitely as much as he knows is Proposed, believe all
 And is not only in *Præparatione animi* ready to embrace that is
 more, when more is Proposed, But even now in eve- revealed.
 ry Act of Faith He Elicits (as I noted above) Impli-
 cily, and Virtually Submits to All That God hath
 explicitly Revealed. That Distinction therefore

A Distinction of Sacraments, unnecessary.

which some of our New men here Introduce, viz. Of Things Necessary to Salvation, respectively to such as are of weaker Capacities, and of Things Necessary to be owned in order to Salvation by Christian Societies, as Bonds of Ecclesiastical Communion, is to no Purpose. (unless we speak of a less or more Explicit Belief, which may be Various according to a Dark, or Clearer Proposition.) The Reason is; Because All that God Reveals (and neither more nor less) is *One*, and the same *Respectively* to All, to the Learned, to the Unlearned, to weak and Strong Capacities; Yea, And to the whole Church also, and this All Acknowledge in every Act of Faith They have, Though, perhaps, it be less extended to particular Articles. But know, as is now noted, That the true Worth of Faith Consists not so much in the Extensive Reach of it to more Material Objects, As in an Intensive and Equal Submission to Gods Veracity in the things He Speaks, which now I yield to by the explicit Faith I have, And am ready to do more when a Clearer Proposition, and Gods Command Require it. Whence you se, Though a Rustick hath less of the Explicit Belief Then a Learned Clerk; Yet, He want's not therefore One Grain of Supernatural Faith that Saves all Christians: For His Faith is, *virtually*, as far Extended as any Doctors, And his *Infused Habit*, Every whit as Good. If any one cavil at the Distinction of *Explicit* and *Implicit* Faith, He may Correct his Errour by this one Example. Give me One that hath read over Holy Scripture, and Descend's by *Explicit* Faith to every Verity in it: He Believes well. Another far from That *Extensive* knowledge, knows some Verities Revealed There, and Believes them: nevertheless, He *owns* All and every

The worth of Faith not in the Extension but in submission.

How far the Faith of the unlearned is extended.

Disc III.C.IV. *Fundamentals, Vnreasonable.* 253

every *Nota* in the Book for Gods Sacred Word. Tell me, I Beseech you; Hath not this more Ignorant Man with his lets Explicite Assent, As true Saving Faith as the Other? Yes, most Assuredly, And in the Sense now Declared, as *Far Extended*. This is our very Case. Could we Therefore once Agree about the *Proponent of Faith*, most Difficulties were ended. These few Considerations Premised.

Saving Faith as well found in an implicit as in an Explicite Belief.

4. My first Assertion is. *The Distinction usually made by Protestants of Points more or less Fundamental in order to Christians, is not only Vnreasonable; but also very Fals, if we consider the Articles of Faith subsisting, as it were, Or, Essentially Depending upon Gods Eternal Revealing Verity; For as They are Here, All stand firm alike, And equally sure upon this Verity.* If therefore I Answer with my Faith to what this Motive firmly requires, *And as undoubtedly Believe, as God Speaks, I must Assent to all with equal Assurance; nor, can I Believe some and Disbelieve others, when all are Proposed alike: No, nor make Less, or more Degrees of Certitude in my Faith.* From whence I Infer, That no man, by any Means or Search whatever, can find out what Articles are Fundamental, what not, Because There is no Means possible to find that which is not to be Found, But *Fundamentals* and not *Fundamentals* are not to be found, And I prove the Minor. Every Revealed Article, is Asserted by an *Infinite Verity*; But an Infinite Verity Deliver's all it Speaks with *one and the same Infinite Certainty* (where no Degrees of more or less Certitude can have Place) *Ergo*, All Articles of Faith have one and the same like Infinite Assurance, as They are Spoken by an Infinite Verity.

Protestants Distinction of Points more or less Fundamental is fals.

All Faith stand's firm upon Divine Revelation.

There is Nothing of the less or more certitude when God Speaks.

All revealed Truths therefore are equally certain.

254 Disc.III.CIV. *Protestants Discourses of*

Consequently one is as Ponderous as another, And Equally Fundamental, if We (which is only to be Regarded) do Respect the Motive. Again. If some Articles be Fundamental and others not, it is either Becaus the Fundamentals Rely on a Greater Verity, and the Non-Fundamentals on a Less (which is utterly Fals, for the same Infinit Truth Speak's them all;) Or, Becaus, though He delivers all, yet His Pleasure is, That we Esteem of some more Fundamental Then others, And this is Impossible, *Viz.* *That an Infinit Verity takes, as it were, the pains to Speak to us and for our Eternal Salvation, And yet doth not Oblige us to Believe Him in what He saith, with the whole forces of our Soul. It is, as I have shewed, Highly against the Dignity of God, To engage his Eternal Truth in Speaking to us, And yet have Those He speak's to, Talk, as if it Matter'd not, whether He be Heard or no.*

It dishonours God not to Believe All He speaks equally,

5. You may Reply. Some Things Revealed to us seem light in regard of the Material Object: For who can Own it as Fundamental an Article of Faith to Believe that *St. Paul* left his cloak at *Troas*, as to Believe the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son also? I Answer. God (as we now Suppose) Speak's both these Verities, Therefore both are *Equally True*; And if equally True, I cannot Believe the one upon the Motive of Gods *Veracity*, and Disbelieve The other (when Propounded) without a *Forfeiture* of all Faith. The Disparity therefore, which Ariseth here From the *Matter Revealed*, Imports nothing to the present Question.

We cannot believe the greater Matter, and Disbelieve the lesser without Forfeiture of Faith,

6. You may say Again. *The Necessity of Things, which by in Gods great Design, and are Absolutely to be Believed, must be*

Disc. III. C. IV. Fundamentals, Vnreasonable. 255

be taken from the Reference They have to our last End, which is Eternal Salvation. Answ. I say so too. But ^{General} This is only general Talk, and comes not Home to the Question; For, the Question rightly stated Drives at Particulars, and Ask's how many of those *Precisely* have Reference to this last End, or, are Necessary to Salvation *Respectively* to All, after a *Sufficient Proposition*. ^{No Article} Catholicks Say, the Belief of all is so far Necessary, ^{Revealed} That not one of All those *revealed Articles* can be *Dis-* ^{can be Dis-} *believed*. ^{believed.} Protestants make their Exceptions, Yet hitherto never Dared to give in a Catalogue of what They except, nor can say, That the Belief of such and such Articles, are to be excluded as Vnnecessary to Salvation.

7. Nay I Affirm more. It is Impossible for Them by their own Principles to Exclude any. To prove my Assertion. Observe First. ^{Sectaries} They can no more say ^{cannot say} *by a true general Proposition: This whole Bible, I have now* ^{what Arti-} *in my Hands, is Gods own Word, and exclude the least Ve-* ^{cles are to} *rity in it from being Gods true Word; Then, They can say by* ^{be excluded} *a true general Proposition: All men are by nature Mortal, and* ^{as unneces-} *exclude any particular Man from being Mortal.* ^{sary to Sal-} For, as the Mortality of every particular man makes so far forth This Proposition True, That if One be by nature Immortal, it is Fals; so the Truth of every particular Article in Scripture Verifies so far the other Proposition, That if one Article be not Gods true Word, the General Proposition is Fals also. Now I Assume. But Protestants say, to Believe Scripture to be the true Word of God, at least in a General way. (which implyes the Covenant of Grace and Faith in Christ) is Indispensably necessary to Salvation; Therefore They must also Say, To believe ^{vaion.} ^{Sectaries} *every particular Article contained in Scripture, as being* ^{cannot by} ^{their Prin-} ^{ciples di-} ^{stinguish} ^{between} ^{Funda-} ^{mentals} ^{and others,} ^{To believe} ^{Scripture} ^{in a gene-} ^{ral way,} ^{that im-} ^{plies the} ^{Covenant} ^{of Grace,} ^{is necessary} ^{to Salua-} ^{tion.} *exactly*

236 Disc. II. C. IV. *Protestants Discourses of*
truely Gods Word, is in like manner Indispensably Necessary to
Salvation, Becaus this General Belief carries as well in
it an Owning of every particular Truth in Scripture,
as the General Assertion of All-mortal Ascrib's Mortali-
ty to every particular man. The Reason is clear.

The Reason.

Scripture
 Consists
 of Particu-
 lar Veri-
 ties.

Faith must be of Particulars.
For as Scripture is not made up of Generalities, But Es-
entially is constituted of the particular Verities con-
tained Therin; so, if my Faith truely and intierly
Own Scripture for Gods Word, it is Extended to no
Generality in the Object (For there is none) But to par-
ticular Verities, Though the Mode or Tendency of the Act be
not always perfectly Explicit.

The Belief
 of Every
 particular
 in Scriptu-
 re relates to
 Eternal
 Happiness.

8. If you Say. The Argument Here proposed
 seem's Fallacious, Becaus it Proves at most, That
 every little Matter in Scripture may be an Object of
 Faith, But no way Inferred the Belief of them Necessa-
 ry to Salvation (For 'tis very different To Affirm, Such
 a Thing I may Believe, And another to own the Belief of
 it Necessary to Salvation) if this, I say, be the Reply, my
 Answer is : That, as well the Belief of every particular Ve-
 rity in Scripture, hath the same Relation to mans Eternal Hap-
 pines, as the general Belief of owning Scripture for
 Gods Word hath, not only Becaus the Particular is
 included in the General, But chiefly on this other Ac-
 count, That being a Supernatural Elicit Act of Faith,
 it can aym at no other End But mans Supernatural
 Happiness; For under this Notion of Supernaturality it
 Leaves; as it were, the Limits of Nature, and raiseth
 a Soul to Eternal Bliss. Where you se, That, Both
 the Means and End univocally Agree in being Super-
 natural, and are alike suitable To one another. Per-
 mit me to Evidence this Truth further, and Ask,
 Whether

Disc. III. C. IV. *Fundamentals, Vnreasonable.* 257

Whether the Denial or Disbelief of the least Truth That God Speaks in Scripture (once Owned for his Word, and Sufficiently Propounded) makes not a Man an Hæretick? Yes most assuredly. For by Denying That to be True, which He knows God Saith is True, He pertinaciously Opposeth himself to an *Infinis Veracity.* Ergo, The True Act of Faith contrary to this Infidelity of Necessity makes him a Faithful Believer.

The Disbelief of the least matter in Scripture makes one an Hæretick.

But that which necessarily makes him a Faithful Believer hath not only Reference to his last End, But is also necessary to Salvation (for as Infidelity looseth Heaven, so True Faith is Necessary to gain it) Therefore the Belief of every little Article is not of little, But, in this Sense, of as main Consequence, as the Greatest.

That which makes one a Faithful Believer hath reference to Salvation.

And here by The way you may well Reflect upon the Desperate Talk of some Later Men, who Tell us: That All things contained in Scripture, are not so Necessary in order to our End, some being as so great a Remove from this End, That the only Reason of Believing them, is Because they are Contained in Scripture.

The Belief of Every little matter in the sense now explicated is not Little

A most unworthy saying, which makes God to have Spoken a Thousand idle Words in Scripture; For, there They stand uselessly in the Book, without Benefit, without subserviency or Relation to any further good, But only to be looked on. You may Read them, and pass by them as Things wholly Vnnecessary to our Final End. A strange Concept They frame of Scripture, that make it up (as Ill Apothecaries do sometimes Physick) of Vnnecessary Ingredients.

Mr. Stillingsfleet's Doctrine refuted.

9. You may Reply. Some Catholicks seem to Divide the Object of Faith into that which is *Per se*, By it Self Necessary, And By Accidents or, Secondarily

The sense of Divines Concerning Matters Necessary.

K k

258 Disc. III. C. IV. Protestants Discourses of

per se, and
secondarily
Necessary.

Why called
Primary
Objects of
Faith.

Something
in regard of
the Matter
are not ne-
cessary,
Though
being writ
become Ne-
cessary.

They least
matter in
Scripture is
an Object
of Faith.

Necessary. Ergo, They Acknowledge Fundamental, and not Fundamental Doctrins in the Sense of the Question now Proposed. I Deny the Consequence: For, They only hold some *Verities* to be so Principally Necessary to the Essence of Christian Faith, That if They had not been Revealed at All, or, Now were unknown, Christian Religion would absolutely Perish; But it is not so in Others. For example: Had God never Revealed any thing Touching *Christ our Lord, the Sacred Mystery of the Incarnation, or a Trinity &c.* The very Essence of our Religion would not have been, And therefore These are called *Primary Objects* (*Ratione materia*) Because if we have no knowledge or Faith in *Christ*, we have no Christian Religion. Contrarywise. Had the Holy Ghost not at all Inspired the *Hagiographers* to write much of the Historical part in Scripture (which is writ) or never Told us that *Abraham* had two Sons, yet we might have Known *Christ*, and perfectly Believed in Him: Such *Verities* then, Because of the Matter, are not *Per se* so Necessary. However, Being now writ, They are True Objects of Faith, Because God Speak's Them. It is Therefore one thing to say: These *lesser matters* (if not writ at all) had not been necessary to constitute Religion; And another thing to say, Now when They are writ, and spoken by Almighty God, They do not integrate the total Object of Faith, But may be looked on as *Parergons*, or, as Things void of all Reference to our Eternal Happiness. It is, I say, Impossible to own them with so poor a Belief, which, if it be Resolved, Proves No Faith at all. And therefore it is Impossible, Because, when I say by a General Proposition, I am bound to Believe firmly All that God Speak's, I cannot but Believe also every Particular comprised under that

Disc. III. C. IV. Fundamentals, Vnreasonable. 259

that General at least implicitly as is Already both Declared and Proved.

10. My second Proposition is : *Although contrary to Sentences, Truth, we gratis Permit Protestants to Distinguish between, though we Points Fundamental, and not-Fundamental, yet They are so Admit of the Distinction be- unprovided of all means to make good the Distinction, or to tween Fundamental and others, Sever the Fundamentals from the Other, That They shall never Speak so much as one Word probably on this Subject.*

11. Some fraudulently shuffling all of with Generalities; Think They say much, when nothing is touched on to the Purpose, and Define, First, *What ever Appear's to me upon sufficient Enquiry to be Revealed by God, I am bound so. Believe it by Virtue of Gods Veracity.* First: *Why am I bound to Believe twenty Verities in Scripture, when the Belief of them hath, as you Say, no Reference to Eternal Salvation? Why should God oblige me to Believe that now, which will do me no good Hereafter? Yet farther. You Talk of Enquiry. Tell me of whom must we Enquire; of our own Fancies? These lead us, as we se in the Quakers, to a Thousand Fooleries. Of an Vnerring Church? You own, none to Enquire of. Of Scripture? This Occasion's Errour upon Errour, And, as Appear's by the Endles Dissentions of Hareticks, may as well lead us to Deny Fundamentals, as rightly. to acknowledge them: They define Pope-like. Secondly: All things, not equally appearing to all Persons to be revealed by God, the same measure of necessity cannot be extended to all Persons. The Assertion only shew's what is Evident, That all Persons cannot have alike the same Explicit Faith; But 'tis far of from Proving, That all Gods Verities, when pro- pounded, have not Relation to Belief, and Salvation Also.*

Yet this is the true State of the Question concerning Fundamentals, as Appears by These men, who put a Difference between some Revealed Points and Others.

True Faith
believes all
Implicitly.

Those, upon the General Account of Divine Revelation are Necessary; These, of lesser Reckoning. stand at a great distance from absolute Necessity, We say all are Necessary when Proposed, yea, and all are Implicitly Believed in every True Act of Supernatural Faith. 3. They say:

Perfect
Obedience
is resolved
into parti-
cular Com-
pliances
with Gods
will.

An universal Assent to the Will of God, and Universal Obedience to it, are absolutely and indispensably Necessary to all Persons, to whom Gods Word is Revealed. The Assertion (though most true) run's on in Terms too Universal, And must, if it speak of an Efficacious Obedience, be Resolved into particular Compliances with Gods Will, Otherwise it Destroyes it self: For no Man can say: I now Purpose to yeild Obedience to Gods Will, And, in sensu Composito of this Volition, Resist his Will in any particular. Therefore if it be his Will (as most certain it is) That I Hear Him and Obey Him in every Particular He Speak's; my Purpose also of Compliance with his Will, cannot but joyntly Embrace, and Extend it self to those Particulars, either Implicitly, which is don in every due Submission to God, Or, more Explicitly, when I Hear his Will Propounded in such and such particular Matters.

No Genera-
lity in Ob-
jects. The
Object
therefore of
Faith in-
cludes so
many Par-
ticulars.

12. I have already given the Reason hereof. Be-
caus, there is no Generality in Objects, The total Ob-
ject Therefore of my Faith, as *condistinguished* from my
Act of Believing, includes *à parte rei*, nothing els, But
so many Particulars as God hath Revealed. In like
manner the Object of my Obedience, implies a Sub-
mission to so many Particular Commands. He There-
fore,

Disc. III. C. IV. *Fundamentals, Vnreasonable.* 261

re, who saith by a General Act, *I Believe all that God* And a de-
tistical Obe-
dience ex-
tend's to so
many
Commands
Speak's, I Obey him in all He Command's, Fasten's upon
nothing *à parte rei*, But on Particular Revealed *Veri-
ties*, and Particular *Intimated Commands*, nor can He,
by a General Act, more Believe All, and exclude So-
me, then exclude All and believe Some. For want
of well Pondering this Truth, our Protestants (whilst
they own an Vniversal Belief of Scripture necessary to
Saluation) shall fumble as long as they live in Their
Specifying *Particular Fundamentals*, Becaus the Vni-
versal owning of Scripture, owns likewise all Particulars
in it. Exclude Particulars, And you make Null the
Vniversal Proposition.

He that
Believe's
Scripture
in General,
Believe's
every Par-
ticular.

13. Others Lay this charge on us, to Believe All
that God Reveal's in Scripture, and there we shall
surely meet with the Fundamentals of Faith. Answ.
Though we *Gratù* admit, That all Necessary Points
are contained in Scripture, yet it is too great a Task,
Yea, and impossible also, for every Simple Man to
read the Book over. But Suppose this be don, He
may not only fall into twenty Errours concerning Scrip-
ture. But also most easily judge that to be Funda-
mental which is not, and that not to be Funda-
mental which is; And if He do so, He hath nei-
ther Doctor, nor Prompter at hand, to Vnbeguile
him.

C H A P. V.

*An Answer to one Reply.
More of this Subject.*

*An Objection
grounded
on a mistake.*

*The
Church
can Declare
it self
farther,
when
doubts occur,
Scripture cannot.*

1. **H**ere briefly I Answer to a trivial Objection of our Adversaries, who esteem us Catholicks, Though we own an Infalible Church, as far of from knowing the Fundamentals of it (or giving in a Distinct Catalogue of them) as They are after *their Reading Scripture*. The Objection (grounded on a Mistake) is Forceles: For, with one Unanimous and equal Submission We Believe all That the Church Proposeth, which, when Doubts occur, is Ready, Able, and Sufficient to *Declare it self*. Scripture cannot do so, As is Manifest by the endles Dissentions of Protestants in this very Question of Fundamentals. Now, He That believes All that the Church Proposeth as Points of Faith, Admits likewise of every Particular, and with the same Certitude, Though, Perhaps, He clearly Distinguishes not between Matters of Faith, and Others; But this Distinguishing (when exactly don) only *Perfect's Explicit* Faith, And therefore, as it Gives no Addition of more Faith *absolutely Necessary* to Salvation, so the Want of it Deprives us not of any thing necessary to that End of Happines. The Reason hereof is clear out of the Precedent Discours: For, He who by an Universal Assent Admits of all that the Church Teaches *as Faith*, cannot but

Im-

Implicitly Believe This Particular, *if it be of Faith*,
 Though He yet know's *not so much*, yea, and may
 sometimes rationally Doubt, whether the Church Pro-
 poseth it or no, *as a Matter of Faith*. So Schoolmen,
 of different Judgements, often Dispute whether such
 and such Points are *de Fide*, And becaus They are
 contrary in their Positions, either These or Those
Contentents (light where it will) *err Materially*; yet, I
 say, The Erring Party, who Admits of All that the
 Church Proposes, *as Faith*, to be *de Fide*, Believes
 Implicitly (upon his Universal Assent to *All*) *The very*
Matter, which He by Error Explicitly Denyes, yea, and
hath as True Faith as the Other That Hitt's on Truth. Nei-
 ther is there so much as a seeming Contradiction be-
 tween These two Judgements, of *True Implicit Faith*,
 and an *Untrue Material Explicit Error*: For the one is
 so far from Opposing the other, That the Erroneous
 Judgement in *Actu exercito* yeilds to Truth, and re-
 solved into all the strength it Hath, faith no more
 but This, by a *conditional Tendency*. *If what I Affirm*
be not contrary to the Churches Doctrin. And hence it is,
 that Catholicks (God be ever Blessed) do not only
 easily lay down their material Errors, when the
 Church Declares against them, But most usually also,
 in Their learned Volumes, submit All They write to
 the Judgement of the Church, which Implies a ra-
 cite *Restraint*; or an unlaying of whatever shall be
 Censured, or, Sentenced to be Amis. O, would
 our Protestants Acknowledge such a Living Judge of
 Controversies, They might make excellent good Use
 of Their Bible; But to snatch that Pure Book from
 Catholicks (as they have Don) And afterward to De-
 base

One may doubt whether the Church proposeth such a matter as Faith, and yet believe it implicitly if it be of Faith.
An Instance.
A man may believe implicitly what by Error he denies Explicitly.
No Contradiction between true implicit Faith and untrue material Explicit Error.
The Reason.
Learned Catholicks submit to the Churches Censure.
Sectaries submit to nothing but Fancy.

base it, to Prostitute it to every Wild Fancy, That shall pleas to meddle with it, is plainly to Abjure and Renounce all Possibility of either knowing what Fundamentals are ; Or, of ever Arriving to better Settlement in Faith, then now we se, which indeed is none at all. Therefore though they Protest a Thousand times, That they Believe every Thing in Scripture with the like *Implicit Faith, as we do the Church*, it Avail's nothing, whilst every Private man makes that Book to speak what he would have it, That is, what his Fancy Pleases.

2. Others finally have Recours to the Apostles Creed, and say All things there (as They Relate to Scripture) and no more, are Fundamental Points of Faith. First : Admit of the Assertion, without any likelihood of Proof, Protestants have little to glory in; For, *There is not so much as One Article of their Religion; as Protestancy (Observe it well) contained in the Apostles Creed, Therefore nothing of their Religion, as Protestancy, can be Accounted Fundamentally Necessary to salvation.* 2. One may Admit of All those *Express Words* in the Creed. *I Believe in Iesus christ His only Son*, and be an Hæretick ; For the *Arians* grant this, and yet are Hæreticks ; Becaus They Deny the *High Godhead of christ*, and *consubstantiality* likewise with his Father, which are not evidently deduced out of those Words. And Here, I would gladly know of Protestants, when either *Arian* or any Sectary That doth not only Abstract from *Christs* supream Divinity, But Positively also Abjures it, yet in some manner frigidly own's *Christ for the only Son of his Father*, whether, I say, such an One may be Reckoned of as a True Believer in Fundamentals?

3. Though

*The Belief
of the A-
postles
Creed not
Sufficient
for Salva-
tion.*

*Nothing of
Protestan-
cy in the
Apostles
Creed.*

*Let it please
the Scribes
to answer
this Que-
stion plain-
ly.*

3. Though the Creed Compriseth much in that One Article, *I believe the Holy Catholick Church* (And therefore some Ancient Fathers most Deservedly Magnify the compleatnes of it , as an Excellent *summary* of Christian Faith) yet Protestants for their lives, cannot say , what or where this Catholick Church is, And it is very hard to oblige me to the Belief of a Church , which is neither known nor can be Pointed out. Now were it known, a great Difficulty yet remain's to be Examined , *Viz.* Whether God will ever Preserve this Church Infallible in the Delivery of Fundamental Doctrin , or (supposing His present Decree) *Whether He can so leave it to a Possibility of Erring in Fundamentals , That Christians may absolutely lose all Faith, both of Christ and Creed ?* If This Second be Granted , We have no Assurance, after all Christs Promises to the contrary , *But that Christianity may totally Perish before the Worlds End.* If they Say , God will ever Preserve a Church Infallible in Fundamentals , They must joyntly Acknowledge a Continued *unextinguished* Society of Christians, wherof some are Pastors, and Teach *Infally* these Fundamentals, and some Hear them also *Infally*. I would have these plainly Marked out, And withall have Sectaries know, That All their Difficulties Proposed against an Infallible Church must be solved by them, if they grant such Infallible Teachers of Fundamentals , as is largely Proved Above. 4. To Omit, that the Creed Delivers no Explicite Doctrin concerning Baptism and the Eucharist (Though the Belief of these are also Necessary to Salvation) Thus much I observe, That Catholics , without Glosses and Interpretations, own the candid and plain Obvious Expressions of the Creed in

Protestants cannot plainly point at the Church which the Creed Call's Catholick.

Sectaries are pressed whether they grant or Deny, a Church infallible in Fundamentals.

Sectaries must solve their own Difficulties.

Baptism and the Eucharist not in the Creed.

Catholicks Admit of the Creed without Glosses.

All, and Every particular Article of it : Therefore They are at least (if uot more) as good Believers of the *Creeds Fundamentals* as *Sectaries*, And, if (which we Deny) They Err by Ignorance in lesser Matters, as Protestants May, and Do Err in Greater, They must yet grant, that the Belief of Fundamentals is Faith enough to save both Patties. This Supposed,

A word
with Mr.
Poole.

3. I must Needs have a word with my long forgotten Friend *Mr. Poole*, and Ask why He Deem's it such a Strict piece of Justice, to chafe, as He Doth, at a converted Captain, upon the Account of his changing Religion, as if he were a Lost and Perished Soul? An Instrument (forsooth) He will Prove (*Append. p. 2.*) if not of *Gods Mercy* to reduce him to the Truth, from which he is revolted, At least of *Gods Justice*, And a Witnes on *Gods Behalf*, to leave him without Excuse. What needed, I say, so much Ado about Nothing? For both the Captain and all Catholicks, whilst they Believe the Creed Relating to Scripture, are very secure, and Confessedly right in Fundamentals; Which being Supposed, It is more then Impertinent in the Protestant, to Keep such a Coyl about lesser Matters, or, to Reduce the main Controversy between us, to a Trial of That which least Concern's us, and cannot, as they think, be Decided by any Received Principle.

Protestants
keep a
Coyl to no
Purpose
about mat-
ters not
Essential.

Viz. Whether They or we, are better sited in non-Fundamentals, which imports so little (if our Protestants say true) That the Knowing of them is scarce worth our Knowledge, Because They are wholly Unnecessary to Salvation, and Make us neither more, nor les, Essential Members of Christs mystical Body, The Catholick Church.

4. From this Concession of our Adversaries I infer,
That

That no Protestant can probably go about to Draw any Intelligent Catholick from his Religion. First: Because He is as Firm in the Belief of Fundamentals as Any Sectary whoever, And *that* will save his Soul. Now, If they say we Want no Fundamentals, but abound in *Superfluities*, It is only said, and not Proved: However grant all, though contrary to Truth, These Redundancies Hinder not Salvation, and may well be Listed amongst *Non-Necessaries*. 2. No Catholick voluntarily Opposeth Himself to so much as to one *iota* of Gods Word Sufficiently Proposed, nor, can He, and Remain Catholick. 3. He cannot Thwart his Judgement of Discerning, or, go Against his Conscience in Believing Catholick Religion; For by Doing either, He looseth Faith. 4. As long as He is A Cordial and Sincere Believer of the Roman Catholick Faith, He can have no Evident Demonstrations against it, Or Tax this Church of Errour, or, *if in conscience* He Do so, *eo ipso*, He cease's to be a Member of This Church, And is no longer Orthodox.

5. Yet I say More. It is impossible for a Prudent Man (secluding Gross And most culpable Ignorance, which makes him Imprudent) to Shut his Eyes, or, not to Se Those clear Evidences, Those visible *Notes*, Those glorious *Atarks* and *Characters* of Truth, wherby the Church of *christ* is made manifest to the View of All. The wise Providence of God will have this *Discernibility* or *Perspicuity* of it both Apparent, and obvious To Ordinary Prudence. . Otherwise (which is impious) We might blame His Goodnes, and Tell Almighty God. You, O Lord, Assure us in Scripture of our Final Beatitude, But you have (with it) left us

If the Belief of the Creed be Sufficient, Protestants cannot draw Catholicks from their Religion. Superfluities, though granted, hinder not Salvation. How Catholicks may fall from being Catholicks.

A Prudent man cannot but see the great Evidence of Catholick Religion.

How one of Prudence may plead. in Darknes concerning the Way and Means to Find it out, And to Attain this Happines. *What Avail's it to know the End, And so be Invincibly Ignorant of the Means?*

What Answer Satisfies. All, who profess Christianity are not True Believers. How shall we Discern the Hæretical Societies from O-ther? *Christ Answers: Your Way, By the Light and Guidance of Those Marks of Truth which manifested me, when I first Taught Christianity, and yet Beautify my only Church, is so Clear, and Evident without Dispute. Vo nec fluit errent per eam,* That is hard For the most Ignorant To miss of it, much more For the Prudent.

Catholicks cannot, unless Evidently convicted of Error, which is impossible, Desert Their Faith. 6. No Conviction therefore, No evident Demonstration can so forcibly Press upon a Catholick, As to make him to Desert His Faith, And if He stand not evidently convicted of manifest Errour, it were worse then Madnes in him, yea, and Damnable also to Change his Religion. Let Sectaries therefore Stentor-like Cry out, Till They grow Hoars again (*Mr. Poole all along smoothes his Discours with such Harsh Eloquence*) O ye blind Papists, O ye seduced Men, when will ye open your Eyes &c? The Solid Catholick Answers, Railing is no Reason: *Your Ancestors and mine were Papists Before You, or, Your Hæresy were in Being.* I believe my Creed as

Their solid Answer to All Opponents. well as you, I Admit of every Word in Scripture as well as you, I go no more against my Judgement, or Conscience (nor perhaps so much) as you Do. Wherin then am I faulty? Nay, I must yet Tell you More. Though (by a Supposed Impossibility) The Church wherof I am a Member should err, and I joyntly be in Errour with it, Yet as long as the Errour is unavoydable And invincible in me (wherof my Conscience Reproves me not) it is, in your own Principles, no matter of Damnation,

nation, Because Ignorance excuses me. Therefore, *as I am every way without blame in my Belief, so I cannot be reclaimed from it by you.*

The Catholick Every way without blame.

7. But, saith the Catholick: Give me a Company of men who Admit of Christ, and so far Deny His Church, That They cannot say where it is; That will Reform Their Elder Brethren, Before They have Certainty of Their own Half made Reformation; That think Themselves wiser then all the now Living, And the Ancient deceased Defenders of the Roman catholick Church; That have causeless Separated Themselves from an Ancients Church, And Yet are not ioyned to Any Society of Christians, which Beares the Resemblance of a Catholick Community: Who, never yet had so much as one General Council to Direct Them, no Infallible Oracle to Teach them, No Motives, No Miracles, to Evidence their new Faith: Who make every private Person a Church, Every mans Reason Judge of High Mysteries, that transcend Reason: Who Take and Leave what They list in Matters of Faith upon no other Warrant, But their own wilful Choise: Who seemingly own an Universal Church, But yield Obedience to None: Who are Always seeking for Truth, without Hope of finding it; Always Teaching more Learned Then Themselves, And yet to this day, Know not what they Teach: Who Too unluckily spend the few Days of Their Life in Scribbling Controversies, Though they see it is to no Purpose (For besides a high Offence given to God) All The Credit They gain in the Christian World Abroad, (And their Repure at home, amongst intelligent Persons is no better) Amounts to This Ignominy, That unfortunately They Patronize a late invented Harely, which at last They must quit, or quite Despair of Salvation. Give me, I say, such a sort of Men, They are not only battered and Battered, But Also by most Pressing Arguments (Drawn

He evidently Convinces Several of Their Errors and most unhappy for-jaking the Ancient Church.

Protestancy described, as it is.

both from Authority and Reason) May be evidently convinced ; yea , And (if Gods Grace want not) easily Reclaimed from Their Errors , If *Perversnes* in some , and *Ignorance* in others (I mean the Ignorance of Pride) *Hinder not Their Conversion* . But to Withdraw a Knowing Catholick , upon *Rational Inducements* From his Religion , is Impossible . It is true , They have Gained some Profylits (Vnnatural Children to Their Ancient Mother Church) But how ? Alas Too indulgent to Flesh and Blood , they were allured by Sensual , not Rational Motives . The Truth is Evident . I say no more .

*How They
have gain-
ed some
Profylits.*

*Thres
things to be
noted in
this Que-
stion of
Fundam-
mentals,*

*One con-
cerns the
formal
Object of
Faith.*

*The other
relates to
its proposal.*

*The Third
to the mat-
ter belie-
ved.*

8. To End this Chapter of Fundamentals , Be Pleased to Observe these Three Things . 1. If we Consider the Motive of Faith , which is Gods Veracity ; what ever He Speaks little or great , is with one and the same Respect and Profound Reverence to be Assented to , And here is no Difference between Fundamentals , and Others . 2. If we speak of the *Proposition* of Faith ; Herein also There is no Difference : For , no man can Believe a Fundamental , Doctrin Sooner Then Not Fundamental , unless the one as well as the Other be Sufficiently Proposed . 3. If we Speak of the Matter Revealed , I have shewed Above , That some Points in Themselves , or *Per se* , More Essentially Constitute , Yea , And more Conduce to Piety Then others : But , This makes no Distinction between Fundamentals , and not Fundamentals in the true sense of our Question , Because the lesser as well as the greater , Arc upon Gods Testimony Equally Believed , in every true Vniversal Act of Supernatural Faith , wherby we say , *All is to be Assented to , That God Reveals* .

CHAP.

C H A P. VI.

*Some Few Propositions of A late VVri-
ter are Briefly Examined. His
Discours of Fundamentals
Destroy's Protestant
Religion.*

1. **I** Say Briefly : For, I leave much to be Answered by more Learned Adversaries. One Proposition is. *The very Being of a Church, doth suppose the Necessity of what is required to be Believed in order to Salvation.* Very good, but what then? Marry This follows. *If't was a Church, it Believed all Things Necessary before is Defined; How comes it Therefore to make more Things Necessary by its Definition?* First, A word *ad-Hominem*. Protestants, Have now a Church Essentially Constituted, or Have not : If not, Protestantcy is no Christian Religion. If They have such a Church, why do They Add to that which They Conceive to be the Essentials of it, A Cluster of new Articles never owned by any Orthodox Society? For example : No Sacrifice, no Purgatory, no Transubstantiation &c. Could they proceed Consequently to their Principles, they should neither Deny a Sacrifice, a Purgatory &c. nor Assert them, But hold them meer *Patergons*, *Because They have a Church*

Mr. Scilicet's Propositions refused.

Protestants Add to what They conceive Essential to a Church, a company of new unproved Negative Articles. They proceed not consequently to their Principles.

272 Disc. III. C. VI. *Propositions examined*

Church Essentially founded without them. Why therefore, Do They either Deny or Affirm? Why meddle They at all with these Articles? Why load They Protestantcy with the Vnnecessary Burden of so many unproved Negatives, when their Church hath its *whole Being, before these Negatives can be thought of?*

2. In Catholick Principles, both the Proposition and Question are most Simple: For, we own more *Essentials* then Sectaries Do, and Therefore say: *As there was a Church in Being before any Word of Scripture was writ, and consequently the Writing of Scripture Added no new Being to it, Though it declared Things more Explicitly; so in like manner, The present Definitions of the Church Alter nothing of the Ancient Foundations of Faith, But only declare more explicitly Christs Verities contained in Scripture and Tradition.*

As Scripture when first writ, altered not the Antecedents

Churches Doctrin, so the Church now Alters nothing of the Ancients Faith,

They wave the Difficulty.

Catholicks say, All that God Reveals is Necessary to the Being of the Church.

And this Power the Church ever Had in all Ages. Mark well what is said here; For it Clear's All the following Fallacies of our Adversaries Discours,

3. A Second Proposition. *What ever Church owns, those things which are Antecedently Necessary to the Being of a Church, cannot so long cease to be a true Church.* And

here, They say, we must Distinguish those Things in the Catholick Church which give it *Being*, from those Things which are the *Proper Acts* of it, as the Catholick Church. Very true. But the only Question

is, *How much precise Doctrin That is, which gives Being to the Catholick Church?* This our Adversaries (Content with

a general Word of a *Churches Being*) wave, whilst Catholicks say plainly, All that God Reveals, and is taught by the Church *as Revealed*, is so Essentially necessary to the very *Being* of it, That not one Article can be rejected after a Sufficient Proposal. Dare Protestants say thus

much

Disc. III. C. VI. Destructive of Protestancy. 273

much of Their Negative Articles? *No Purgatory, no Real Presence, no Sacrifice &c.* Or, own these as Essentials of Their Church of Protestancy? To that Distinction of the *proper Acts* of the Church (And One is the due Administration of Sacraments) from the Being of it, I answer the Faith of Sacraments, which *Faith con-*
naturally Preced's the use or exercise of them, is *precedes the*
 most Essential to the Being of a Church, and This Be- *use of Sa-*
 lief every true Christian Hath. *craments.*

4. A third Proposition. *The Vnion of the Catholick* *Vnity of the*
Church depend's upon the Agreement of it in making the Church,
Foundations of its Being to be the Grounds of its Communion. and the
For, the Vnity being intended to preserve the Being, there Agreement
can be no reason given, why the bonds of union should extend me.
beyond the Foundation of its BEING, which is, the owning the
Things necessary to Salvation. It is not worth the while
to catch at these improper Expressions. The Vnion of
the Church Depend's upon the Agreement of it: For, No-
thing certainly Depend's on it Self, now, the Vnion
of the Church whether we speak of the Objective Do-
ctrine, or of Faith tending into that Doctrine, is Essen-
tially its Agreement. Therefore Properly it Depend's
not on Agreement, But really is Agreement, As truly
as Vnum, Verum, and Bonum Are Ens, à Parte rei.
Whence I Say: Vnity is not intended to Preserve the
Being of the Church, as a Cause preserves its Effect; For
Vnity essential to the Being, is The very Thing Pre- *Vnity essen-*
served by Almighty God, And therefore cannot Preserve an *tial to the*
Antecedent conceived Being without Vnity. But *Being of a*
let this pass. Consider what follows. They *Church*
say: The Bonds of Vnion should not extend beyond *is the*
the Foundation of the Churches Being &c. Very good. *Thing pre-*
What *served by*
Almighty
God.

Mm

What

274 Disc.III.C.VI. Propositions Examined

Deer Talk
without
proof.

Catholicks
extend not
the unity
of the
Church
beyond its
Founda-
tions, for
They Be-
lieve so
much as
God hath
revealed,
and no mo-
re.

Sectaries
who have
neither
Church nor
Scripture
for one word
of Prote-
stancy,
Most un-
reasonably
pretend to
be the Pre-
servers of
the Church's
Unity.
Their own
saying is
the only
Proof.

What is next? This it is : *Whosoever Church imposeth the Belief of other Things necessary to Salvation, which were not so Antecedently necessary to the Being of the Catholick Church, Break's the Unity of it ; and those Churches, who desire to Preserve Unity, are bound thereby not to have Communion with it, so long as it doth so.* Here is little said, less explicated, and least of all Proved. First, they

say not: How much Doctrine precisely makes up the Churches Being, nor shall ever tell us by their Principles, 2. They name not the guilty Persons that Extend the Union of the Church beyond its Foundations. Are they Catholicks who Believe all that

God Reveals, and is declared by the Church to be Revealed? Or Sectaries, *That have neither Church, nor Scripture for any Article of their Protestancy?* 3. If they

Hold themselves to be the Preservers of the Churches Unity, They must prove it by strong Principles, And first shew Positively by Scripture, That they have just so much as is Necessary and sufficient to Salvation, Before they make us Guilty of any Breach of the Churches Unity. This will be a hard Task : For if they

say, We Break the Churches Unity in believing a sacrifice, a Purgatory &c. They are obliged to prove; and by plain Scripture, That either their contrary Negatives are to be Believed, or, That neither our Positives, nor their Negatives merit an Act of Faith, which is impossible. For, *What Scripture saith we are neither to Believe a Sacrifice, nor the Contrary.*

5. In the next place they come to Solve the Enigma, to explicate the main Subject of the present Dispute, And 'tis to Tell us what those Things are, *Which ought to be Owned by all Christian Societies as Necessary*

Disc. II. C. VI. Destructive of Protestantism. 275

to Salvation, on which the Being of the Catholick Church Depends. Happy were they could they Unriddle the Mystery, And say what Things are thus Necessary; But our Author still run's on in Generals, and Determin's nothing. Be pleased to hear his Resolution.

Protestants
cannot
show what
things are
Necessary.

6. Nothing ought to be owned as necessary to Salvation by Christian Societies, But such things which by the Judgement of all those Societies, are Antecedently necessary to the Being of the Catholick Church. No man, I think, knows to what that Word, Antecedently, relates, nor can this Author make sense of it. One may Guess what he

would be at. He will Perhaps Say: When all Christian Societies stand firmly united in one Judgement concerning the Being and the Essentials of a Church; then we are right in These Essentials. Answ. But this was never yet seen,

They fall
upon im-
possibilities.

nor will be seen as is more largely declared Chap. 2. n.

1. whither I remit the Reader for further Satisfaction.

He Adds two Things more. One is, There cannot

be any Reason given, why any Thing els should be

judged Necessary to the Churches Communion (He means

in Necessary Articles of Faith) But what all those Churches,

who do not manifestly Dissent from the Catholick Church

of the first Ages are agreed in, as Necessary to be Believed by

all. My God! What Confusion Have we here?

Where is the Protestant that can Assure us, without

Dispute, what the Catholick Church of the first Ages

positively Believed and positively Rejected? Could this

one Point be clear'd without Endles Debate, A better

Union might be Hoped for; But herein both We and

Sectaries Dissent, as is Proved above. Therefore by

their Appealing to the Ancient Church, (whilst They

Abstract from the Tradition of a present Catholick

Church)

Who is to
Judge him
that says
He Dissents
not?

Protestants
cannot
show what
the Primitive
Church be-
lieved.

No Appeal-
ing to the
primitive
Church
without

276 Disc. II. C. VI. Propositions Examined

the Tradition of the present Church.

Church) They go about to Prove, *Ignotum per ignotius*, And convince nothing.

Memorable Doctrin.

7. They Add a second Consideration which may be reflected on, *Ad perpetuam rei memoriam*, And 'tis to this Sense. After Their Telling us, That in Case of great Divisions in the Christian World, any National Church may Reform it self (as is Supposed, England hath don) and Declare its Sense of those Abuses in Articles of Religion; yea, and Require of Men a Subscription against those Abuses &c. They go on: We are to consider that there is a great Difference between the Owning some Propositions. in order to Peace, and the Believing of them as Necessary to Salvation. Now Mark what Followes.

Men uncertain in all They say, take on to Teach, wherein Faith is abused.

No Orthodox Church Ever excepted against our Church Doctrin.

The Church of Rome Imposeth new Articles of Faith to be believed (A most unproved Assertion) which Articles, are excepted against by other Churches (name the Orthodox Church that ever excepted against them, it cannot be don) But the Church of England makes no Articles of Faith, But such as have the Testimony and Approbation of the whole Christian World of all Ages, and are acknowledged to be such by Rome it self, and in other things she requires Subscription to them, Not as ARTICLES of Faith, but as inferiour Truths, which she expects Submission to in order to Her peace and tranquillity. And thus much the late Primate of Ireland expresseth to be the Sense of the Church of England as to her thirtynine Articles.

Mark the Doctrin.

Protestant Religion reduc'd to Inferiour Truths.

The English Church consisting of Negatives in no Church.

8. Be it known to all men by These Presents, That the Church of England, so far, as it maintains these Negative Protestant Articles of No Sacrifice, No Real Presence, No Purgatory, is here confessedly owned to have no Articles of Faith Revealed by Almighty God, And therefore so far, 'Tis neither any Christian or Catholick Church,

Church, Because these Negatives (the very marrow of Protestancy) are now *Degraded*, And Thrown down from their *Ancient Heights of Articles*, to the low Rank of a few *Humble, and inferior Truths*.

9. But let us go on. Who Assures you, Sir, of Their being Truths at all? God, you say, that Reveal's nothing but most Supream Truths, Own's none of Them. No Orthodox Church, no Ancient Council, no Vnanimous Consent of Fathers, no, nor your own Synods in England, (Though without Proof They Suppose them to be Truths) ever yet Defined them, as you Two yong Popes do (Doctor Bramhal and your Self) *to be Truths of an Inferiour Rank and Order.* Be it how you will, I am sure, the Declaration before these Articles says, they are Articles of Religion, and contain the true Doctrin of the Church of England *Agreeable to Gods Word.* If so, Gods Word is Agreeable to these Articles, and Proves them. Again. Some of your own Coat, and perhaps as Learned as you, Call them Articles of Faith. Certainly they are none of our *Faith*, Ergo they are yours, or no Bo dies. Upon whom then shall we Rely for the last Definition? I'll tell you. Both the Assertions of their being either *Articles of Faith, or Inferiour Truths*, stand tottering without Proof or Principle, upon the sole Fancy of those who say so.

10. 3. If these Dull Negatives be only Voted for Peace among you, without Reference to your Faith, your Church is *Essentially Hypocritical*, which may Believe one Thing, And must Profess an Other. I now say no more, having Told you enough to this Sense in another place. *Though all the Protestants in England*

Inferiour Truths are none of Gods Truths.

These Articles shew plainly with the 39. Articles.

These Negatives of the 39. Articles are neither Articles of Faith, nor Inferiour Truths.

The English Church is essentially Hypocritical.

Protestants may curse. These Negative Articles, and yet be found in Faith. do not only Dissent in Judgement from the owning of These Negatives; Though they are plain Papists in Heart, yet, and Interiorly curse and Anathematize all your new Articles (if the exterior Demeanour be fairly good, All is Fine) They may be still looked on, as Blessed Children of your new Negative Church. The sequel is undeniable; For, They may Believe all that Scripture saith (And this is Faith enough to Salvation) And yet Anathematize your Negatives, not at all contained in Scripture, And wholly unnecessary to Salvation.

A hard Question proposed to Schismatics.

11. Yet farther. You Protestants Endlessly Talk of Referring us Papists by Scripture. Speak once plainly and Tell us. How can you go about such a work as to reclaim us by Scripture, To a Belief of your Negatives, when you have not one Syllable of Gods Word for Them? For, if you have Scripture, They are Superior Truths Revealed by God, and consequently Articles of Faith: If you have no Scripture, why Preach you fals Doctrin, why Teach you that you can draw Vs from our old Faith to your New Negative Religion, by plain Scripture? No Protestant shall Answer to this short Demand. 4. You cheat the World when you Offer to Resolve Protestants Faith, which is no more Resolvable into Divine Revelation then Arianism is, Because you must now confess that God never spake Word of Protestancy, as *Protestancy*, in the whole Bible. Let therefore the world Iudge, whether it be not a pure Cheat to give a Title of the Protestants Way of Resolving Faith, and then leave that, which the Title Promises, To ask of Resolving a Faith in Common, which stands in no need of your Resolution.

It cannot be Answered.

Protestants resolving Faith, a meer Cheat.

12. To see this more Evidenced, And to end with these

these meer *Nothing*s of Sectaries. Our new Author Tell's us, That the English Church, makes no Articles of Faith, But such as have the Testimony and Approbation of the whole Christian World, of all Ages, yes, And are Acknowledged by Rome it self. If this be so, it is no more an English, then a Church of Arians, of Pelagians, And of all condemned Hæreticks. For, this man would say, That a Faith common to All called Christians, without Believing more, is the English Faith; and Sufficient to acquire Heaven. Mark the Proposition; And ask first, what is now become of the Protestants way of Resolving Protestants Faith? Next, (and most justly) call it a meer Fancy, A new coyned Hæresy contrary to the whole Christian World; For, neither Scripture, nor Councils, nor Fathers, nor any particular Orthodox or Hæretical Church, much less the consent of the whole Christian World, Owned the Belief of that Abstract Doctrin, wherein all Hæreticks Agree to be sufficient to Salvation. The whole Christian World never yet said to Believe in Christ, Abstracting from His Godhead, and Two Natures, is Sufficient. Catholicks hold the Belief of a sacrifice and Transubstantiation &c. Necessary to Salvation; And all condemned Hæreticks as Arians, Monothelists and Others, as firmly Adhere to their Particular Hæresies, as to the Abstract Doctrin of all Christians. Otherwise, they had been worse then mad, to have Abandoned an Ancient Church for a few supposed Inferiour Truths, which, neither can. Un catholic any (if the common Doctrin of all Christians be enough) nor make Them in Reality worse, or better Christians. And here by the way, you se the Hideous sin of Sectaries, who meerly for a Company of Inferiour Truths (if yet They were Truths) have shamefully Deserted

Protestant Church as more a Church then an Arian &c.

The Arian and English Faith agree in Doctrin common to all Christians.

A new coyned Hæresy, contrary to all.

No Hæreticks much less Catholicks Ever yet defended, what our Sectaries here vent upon Fancy only.

Tue

*The ſon of
Sectaries,
who have
troubled
the world
for a com-
pany of ſup-
poſed Infe-
riour
Truths.*

The true Mother Church that made Their Progenitours to be Chriſtians. I ſay, *If They were Truths*: For, I utterly Deny the *Fals Suppoſition*, And therefore preſs our Adverſaries to ſpeak to the Cauſe: That is, to come to *Proofs and Principles* wherby it may Appear That Theſe Negative Doctrins, *No Sacrifice, no Praying for the Dead &c.* Merit ſo much as the very name of *Inferiour Truths*. Theſe Negatives cannot be proved even by Their wonted *Weak Way* of Arguing *Negatively*. *We Read not of a Sacrifice, or praying for the Dead.* For there is no man that Reads Antiquity, But he Find's theſe Doctrins poſitively Aſſerted.

Proteſtants Faith but Fancy. The Rea- ſon. 13. From what is now ſaid, Theſe Sequels undeniably follow. Firſt, that Proteſtants cannot Reſolve their Faith But into Fancy only; For, if they make the common Doctrin of all Chriſtians *only* to be Their *ſufficient Faith* for Saluation, and Reſolve that *into its Principles*, both Fancy and Hæreſy lye at the very Bottom of the Reſolution. And if they Go about to Reſolve Their Negative Articles, The whole *Analysis, the Regreſs, the Reduction* of Them, will come at laſt to no other Principle, But to the ſole Fancy of Sectaries, *who call them Articles of Faith, or Inferiour Truths*. It follows 2. If the Engliſh Church makes no Articles of Faith, But ſuch as have the Approbation of the *whole Chriſtian World* of all Ages (Excluding others) It doth not only Contradiſt the whole Chriſtian World, whoſe particular Communities owned the Belief of more Doctrin neceſſary; But hath neither Faith of thoſe Abſtract Articles now Believed, nor any Faith at all Sufficient to Saluation, as is largely proved

The Engliſh Church contradicts the whole Chriſtian World. And Therefore hath no Faith at all.

proved in the 2. Chap. If Finally, to Assail These Difficulties, Sectaries will Restrain that Ample Term of *the whole Christian World* to their imagined Catholick Church in the Ayr, They are to specify the Particular Societies of this vast Church, And when that's Don, They will find no Abstract Doctrin common to all Christians Admitted of By any, Sufficient to gain Heaven: For, were this true, *There had never been Hereticks or Schismaticks in the World, whilst Christ only (Though his Divinity be denyed) is owned in a general Way.* Wherof more in the 3. Chap.

There never had been Heresy in the world, might Faith common to all be sufficient to Salvation.

14. Here I'll only propose one Question to our Adversaries. When they positively Teach, That, that which our Saviour gave his Apostles in his last Supper, and Priests now consecrate Dayly, was, and is no more But a Sign, a Figure only of Christs Body, My Question, I say, is. Whether, *Their Positive owning of a Sign, or Figure only, Be an Article of their Faith,* or no more, But One of their Inferiour supposed Truths?

If this later; They never Had nor can have any determinate Faith of this Sacred Mystery, which yet God hath most certainly Revealed unto us in Holy Scripture; And consequently They believe nothing of the Blessed Sacrament by Divine Faith, For, *Inferiour Truths are no Articles of Belief with Them.* Contrarywise, if They say the Belief of a Sign, or Figure only, is one of their Articles of Faith, And the Thing Believed an Object of Faith: They must certainly eat their own Words, and confess, That the English Church makes new Articles of Faith, And such, as never Had the Approbation of the whole Christian World, much less of Rome it Self; For the whole Christian World of all Ages never Believed so.

A Dilemma: that cannot be answered.

Inferiour Truths are not Articles of Faith.

Some perhaps

282 Disc. III. C. VI. Propositions Examined

*Some Se-
ctaries be-
lieve they
know not
what.* will Answer: *They Believe in General Christs own Words to be true, Though They know not well what he means, when he said. This is my Body. Answer. If they know not what he spoke, why do They charge Idolatry on us, By the force of their Inferiour supposed Truths, for Adoring Christ in the Sacrament? I am sure Arius of old was an Hæretick, For Denying the High Godhead of our Saviour, upon the Uncertainty of his supposed Superiour Truths; And Sectaries are now in a worse Case, whilst they contradict all Orthodox Churches in the Belief of this Sacrament, And make us Idolaters, Merely upon the Uncertainty of their imagined Inferiour Truths.*

*Their in-
consequen-
ces.*

*They are
in a worse
Condition
Then A-
rians.*

15. Another Proposition is Thus. *Nothing ought to be imposed as a necessary Article of Faith to be believed by all, but what may be evidently propounded to all Persons, as a Thing which God did require the explicate belief of.* Observe the *Vnexplained* words, *Evidently Propounded to all Persons.* Who must propound these Articles of Faith? Must God, Angels, or mens private Fancies Do it? No. The Oracle of Truth *Christs own Church* (find it where you can) is both to Propose Faith to us, and to Decide all Difficulties when they Arise among us, as is Already Proved. Submit to This, and all Controversies are Ended. Here is also another loose Proposition. *Nothing ought to be required as a necessary Article of Faith, but what hath been believed and received for such by the Catholick Church of all Ages.* Sr, say you plainly where this Catholick Church was in all Ages, and tell us exactly How many Articles it Held Necessary, and sufficient to Salvation, And we shall Drive you out of your Generalities, which

*Christ
Church
Can only
propose
Faith unto
us.*

*Another
Proposition
too Gene-
ral and in-
significant.*

Disc. III. C. VI. Destructive of Protestancy. 283

which Prove just nothing, To a more open and Plain Doctrin, wherof you are as much afraid, as the Devil of Holy water. We know not what you mean by the Catholick Church.

They run on in General.

16. Well. But the next Assertion will clear all. *It is sufficient Evidence, that was not looked on as a necessary Article of Faith, which was not admitted into the Ancient Creeds.* Pray you, prove *This sufficient Evidence*, by a clear Principle. Upon what Ground doth the Assertion stand, Distinct from your own Fancy? *The Baptizing of Infants, The Admitting of so many Books for the exact Canon of Scripture, The Belief, all ought to have of the Holy Eucharist,* Are not Explicitly set down in the Ancient Creeds; Therefore we must have Recours to the Catholick Church both for the Faith of these, And many other Articles. But we have said enough of this Subject.

The Belief of the Creed not Sufficient &c.

Necessary Particulars, not Expresses in the Creed.

17. You go on. *Nothing ought to be judged a necessary Article of Faith, but what was universally believed by the Catholick Church so be delivered as such by Christ and his Apostles.* Sr, Before this Proposition be cleared you are to Declare, what you Mean by those Terms, *Believed by the catholick Church.* For, if Rightly Suppose, There was never any True Church, *But the Roman catholick only* continued Age after Age, And upon *This Supposition* Reply (which is easy) to your Assertion, and the Ten following Points. You'll say, I mistake your Meaning concerning the very *Notion of that Church*, which your Fancy makes Catholick. And, if I licence you to *Enlarge The Catholick Church as far as you Please*, or, To comprise in it All who have had the Name of Christians, Though

These Authors say not what is meant by these dark Terms Believed by the Catholick Church.

284 Disc. III. C. VI. Propositions examined

otherwise known Hæreticks, your, Proposition to us, is *de Subjecto non supponente*, of a Subject not Supposable, And the annexed Points are highly Impertinent. Name Therefore Exactly The Catholick Church upon grounded Principles, and all is don.

They are
to specify
what and
where This
Catholick
Church is.

18. After the ending these *Negatives*, They inquire what we ought *Positively* to Believe as Necessary to Salvation, And remit us (without any further Proof but their own saying) to the Articles of the *Ancient Creeds*. This is largely refuted already.

A question
proposed.

Next they propose a question, *Whether any thing, which was not Necessary to salvation, may by any Means whatsoever afterwards become Necessary, so that the not Believing it becomes Damnable.* The Question, If I mistake not,

Whether
The
Church
Can Define
ne any
Thing as
new neces-
sary to Sal-
vation, so
that the
not belie-
ving of it
becomes
Damnable?
The reason
of the
Doubt.

Drives at This, To shew that the Church can make no new *Definitions of Faith Necessary to Salvation*, Because all Faith Necessary is Antecedently supposed, as it were, laid in *The very Churches Foundation before it Defines*, Which Foundations were both *Fully and Solidly laid*, when *Christ* and his *Apostles* Taught the World; For, *the Earth was full of his Knowledge.* He taught his

Disciples all things he had heard of his Father. The *Messias* when he came would tell them all things &c. Therefore a Church solidly Founded, and, before it Defines, full of Truth, can make nothing so Necessary to Salvation by a new superadded Definition, that the not Believing of it, Becomes Damnable.

The
grounds of
Sectaries
showed
Null,
though the
Church
made new
Definitions

19. Before we Answer the Question, it will be good to shew you the Nullity of our Adversaries Grounds, and the Inconsequences of them. Herein lyes the chief strength of all That's said. A Church must be a Church before it can Define, and conse-

quently

Disc. III. C. VI. Destructive of Protestancy. 285

quently There must be a Union in Belief by which The Church is Constituted in Being, Antecedently to its new Definitions. Very Good. All this in True, but makes Nothing Against the Church, though it Defines anew. I'll prove it, and Explicate my self by one Instance. In a Kingdom, or Commonwealth, There is always an Agreement, or Settlement in some great Matters before it Proceed to make new Laws; yet, 'Tis not consequent to say, That the Agreement ought to be so Explicit in all Things, in all Points, in all particular Matters, that nothing afterward can be Decreed anew. It is Therefore sufficient, That these new Laws Arise from some first solid Principles of that Commonwealth, Antecedently settled in Being, And if this be so, They oblige as Much as the former Conventions Did, when it was first settled: Though they were not at all mentioned, at the first Founding of the Commonwealth.

The Reason

Commonwealths though antecedently settled may make new Laws.

20. Answerably Hereunto, One may say. Christ founded a Church Assisted, as is here Supposed, by a Spirit of Truth, the Holy Ghost, and first settled it upon some fewer Principles, from which All other after-Definitions might Proceed, or be Derived. The Church thus Assisted, Defines anew upon the former Settlement, just as the Commonwealth makes new Laws, upon its first Agreement. Such Definitions Therefore, because they Proceed from an Infallible Oracle (call them yet new, or old as you pleas) Are as certain, and of as great necessity to be Believed, As those new Laws are Obligatory, and of necessity to be Obeyed. Here is one Disparity which is not to the Purpose, Viz. That the Commonwealths Laws proceed

The Church assisted by the Holy Ghost Derives new Definitions from its first Settlement.

The parity
holds exactly.

from Human Authority, The Churches Definitions from Divine Assistance. Those oblige under a temporal Punishment, These under Eternal. But the Parity exactly Hold's thus far. *Those Laws were implicitly and virtually contained in the first grounded settlement of the Commonwealth, These of the Church in the first settlement of Christianity.* Those may be called New; These may be also called so. Those become Necessary to be Obeyed; These become Necessary to be Believed.

New Laws are to be obeyed, and new Definitions if any were, are to be believed.

Upon different respects these Definitions may be called either new or old.

Now further. As no man Doubt's, But, That the Church may make new Laws in order to Obedience; so none can but most Unreasonably Doubt of its Power in Setting forth new Definitions. It is very True: Here may be much of a *Questio de Nomine*, Whether They are to be called Old or New, Because of their different Respects. Relating to the first settled Foundations of Christian Doctrine, from whence They Proceed, They may take a Denomination and be called Old, Because Radicated in Those old certain Principles. But, if we consider them as more Ample; Express, and significant Declarations of Gods Eternal Truths; They may, without Offence, or Clashing, in the least with Church-Doctrine, be called New Definitions. Thus much is Briefly said, to shew how groundles our Adversaries Grounds are.

21. But we will not leave the Difficulty Thus. To Answer therefore with more satisfaction, Be pleased to note. *It is one Thing to own a Church perfectly Founded, and fully Instructed in all things Necessary to Salvation: And an Other, to suppose that all know explicitly what That Perfect founded Doctrine is, which God will have to be believed, as Necessary to salvation.* This later Requires a clear Pro-

Two things to be noted.

proposition made by some *Oracle of Truth* of the necessary Doctrin. As is evident in Scripture it self : For, though I own all that Scripture saith to be True in the Sense intended by the Holy Ghost, yet, I must learn by a sure Teacher, what is saith in a hundred difficult Passages.

22. Now to the Question, Whether any thing which was not Necessary to Salvation, may afterwards become so Necessary, that the not Believing it, is Damnable &c. I Answer. *The Question answered.* Nothing is now Necessary to Salvation; after the Churches Definition, which was not Necessary Before, yea, and Believed by the Apostles Themselves.

The ground of my Assertion is : Because the Apostles immediatly Illuminated by Christ our Lord, were made Partakers of His Divine Mysteries; They had *Primicias Spiritus*, the First Fruits of the Spirit; Believed as we believe, Taught as we Teach, and never Delivered Doctrin contrary to the Church in After-Ages. Hence Divines commonly Hold, That the Church properly speaking makes no new Articles of Faith, But only Declares more Significantly and Expressly what Those well Instructed Masters of the Church (Christ's own Disciples) Both Believed, and upon several Occasions Taught others.

And here, one Grand Cheat is to be taken Notice of. Sectaries Think that All those Christian Truths which the Apostles Believed Explicitly, are now Explicitly enough upon Record in Holy Writ. It is an Errour. Our Saviour, as *S. John* Testifies *Cap. 21. v. 25*; Did many Things, which if written in particular, the whole World would not contain. Might not then the Apostles also Believe many Things, As a Sacrifice of Mass, Transubstantiation, Purgatory &c. yea, and Teach those Verities, Though they were not so

The Apostles the first and best knowing Masters of Divine Mysteries.

The Church makes no new Articles of Faith, but only declares more explicitly, what was Anciently of Faith.

All that the Apostles believed was not explicitly in Scripture.

plainly

288 Disc. III. C. VI. *Propositions Examined*

plainly Delivered in Holy Writ (yet expressly enough)
But, that Hereticks might Cavil at them.

*The Reso-
lution.*

23. Here then is my Resolution which is most Ca-
tholick Doctrin . . *Christ our Lord Established a Church, that*
is to Tell us Truth to the end of Ages. This Oracle which
Relies not on Gods Written Word only, But on the Unwritten
also, (undoubted Tradition) answerable to Necessary Oc-

*The Church
useth clear-
er Terms
in her De-
finitions.*

casions of new Hereticks rising up , Or , of Schism
made in Christian Societies &c. Often Proposeth more
Explicitly what the Primiive Faith was , And the A-
postles Believed , *Not that it makes new Articles, if we*
speak rigourously, But proposeth the old ones again, in more
Clear and Significant Terms. And how can Sectaries

*Sectaries
without
Gods Word
written or
unwritten
make new
Definitions*

blame this Procedure, when They, without the War-
rant of Gods Word (written or unwritten) Propose
and Declare, as They think , the Ancient Sense of
Scripture it self to their Hearers , in a Hundred Passa-
ges ? For example *Christ said. This is my Body.*

They ; by a new Proposition Define : *This is a Sign of*
my Body. Will they licence Themselves to Propose
what they please out of Gods Word Already writ, and
Storm at a whole Church if it do so ; or , *Further De-*
clare what was not Writ, yet ever Believed ; Though per-
haps not by all so explicitly, as 'Tis after the Churches clearer
Definition ? The Church in this Proceeds upon a

*Whoever
Denies the
Churches
Definitions
Denies the
old believed
Articles.*

certain Principle (indubitable Tradition) Sectaries Ha-
ve neither Tradition, nor Scripture ; For what they Pro-
pose a new . You se therefore, whoever Pertinaciously
Denies the Definitions of the Church , *Denies not only*
the new Declared, But the old Believed Articles, And conse-
quently is lyable to Damnation.

24. *You se moreover.*

It is not only suitable to
Reason

Reason, But necessary also *for the very Preservation of Christian Religion, That the Church to whom the Mysteries of our Faith were committed,* Though it makes no new Articles, nor Supposeth any other Foundation then what was laid by *Christ and his Apostles,* May yet as Necessity requires; Declare more Explicitly the Primitive Doctrin of Christianity: For, by what better Means can we possibly arrive to the Knowledge of those Necessary Truths which the Apostles either Believed or Taught. Then by their Heirs and Successors I mean The vigilant Watchmen, who were, and still are substituted in the Place of those First Infallible Deceased Masters. They, Blessed Men, ran up and down the World from Country to Country, from House to House, Testifying the Faith of our Lord *Iesus Christ,* yet neither committed all the Truths Delivered by them, to Holy Writ, nor supposed the Ignorant and Unlearned fit Instruments to Teach, as They had Taught. The Legacies Therefore of our Christian Truths were left in surer Hands, I mean, Chiefly in the Custody of the Successors of those first great Masters. Whence it is, That the Apostle commend's to *Timothy* more then once the Keeping of a *Depositum* of mighty Value. which the Fathers, and none more expressly then *Vincensius Lirinensis* call, the Common Catholick Doctrin: Or, to speak in this worthy Authors words upon the Text 1. Tim. 6. 20. lib. contr. prof. He. Novit. Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. 4. cap. 27. *Talentum Catholicum Fidei,* The Catholick Talent of our Faith. *Aurum accepissis,* Add's *Vincensius aurum redde.* Thou O Bishop, Pastor, and Doctor, hast received Gold, render as pure Gold again &c.

Necessary
For Christian Religion.

That the Church declares more explicitly.

Primitive Doctrins.

The Successors of the Apostles Teach

in the place of Those deceased Masters.

The Apostles writ not all They taught.

Deposited Doctrin commended to Timothy.

Talentum Catholicum fidei Vinc. Lir.

O o

What

290 Disc. III. C. VI. Propositions Examined

A further Declaration of Deposited Doctrin allowed of.
The Church called by most Ancient Fathers Depositorium Dives.
The Apostolical Depositum in the Churches hands.
The present Church best inform's us of Apostolical Doctrin.
The most Ancient writings are lyable to Dispute.
Apostolical Doctrin better preserved in the hands

What things thou hast learned, so Teach, Adorn, and Illustrate (and mark Here a further Declaration of the Deposited Doctrin Allowed of) *ut cum dicas Novè non dicas Nova*, That when Thou proposes Things *ancient*, Thou Teach not new Things, but the old Doctrin. And hence it also is, That the Church of Christ is stiled by most Ancient Fathers *Depositorium Dives*, a Rich Treasury, wherein the *Depositum* of Apostolical Doctrin is Kept, And not only once Kept, and then lost, But (as a *Depositum* ought to be) its Handed down from Age to Age, from Church to Church, Successively continued to the Worlds End. If therefore you look for the *Apostolical Depositum*, Leap not, I Beseech you, over the Heads of all those Christians, who have been betwixt Us and the first 3. or 4. Ages, As if it were to be found There, and no where els, But Demand of this present Church now in Being, 'Tis She that Knows better, And Inform's us more exactly of Apostolical Doctrin, Then all the lost Writings of the Ancient Church could have done, or, those that are hitherto preserv'd can do; Because they are all lyable to endles Disputes, and Consequently can absolutely Decide no controversy. Now if any one Boggles at this Assertion, as if we could not have *sufficient Certitude* of what the Ancient Church Delivered, by the Testimony, or Tradition of the Present Church, But further Requir's Express Records to be Produced of all that was ever Taught; Let him correct his Errour and know, That, what is Carved in Brass, or Writ in Velum cannot be more securely Kept, then Apostolical Doctrin, Deposited in the Hands and writ in the Harts of Christs faithful Pastors, is now Preserved. For, what's in Brass or Partchment, Time may wear out

out and blemish; But that which God hath committed to his Church and Chief Pastors therof, who are to Teach Christians Age after Age, shall never Perish, never Pass, or be put out of Remembrance. And this Doctrin the Church Deliver's more *Explicitly* in her Definitions, chiefly when she Declares Truth against Hæreticks.

*of Christs
Pastors,
then if's
had been
carved in
Brass.*

C H A P. VII.

*More of this Subject. Objections are
Answered.*

1. **T**O go on with our Discours, I would willingly Know, when the Apostle Exhort's the *Galatians cap. 1. versf. 8. 9. Not to Believe an Angel, Preaching contrary to what He had Preached,* and They had formerly Received; As also the *Thessalonians 2. c. 2. 14. to Hold the Traditions learned by Word or Epistle.* Whether we can Imagin, that, all the Apostles Orally Delivered *was Either Expressly Registered* in Scripture, or the whole Substance of that Divine Doctrin (of equal Certitude with Gods written Word) *is now Totally lost?* Neither is Probable. The Essentials therfore of that Doctrin, laid up sure in the rich Treasury of the Church, still Remain with *Christs* own Faithfull Pastors. And this is the *Deposicum* mentioned in Scripture, whereby the Church (Assisted by the Holy Ghost) Regulars Her self when She Defines. Therefore great Divines Assert, That the Church, never Teaches, or, will

*All that
the Apost-
les Orally
taught was
neither
writ, nor
can be sup-
posed lost.*

*The Essen-
tials of it
remain in
the Churches
Treasury.*

292 Disc. III. C. VII. *More of this Subject.*

The Do-
ctrin of
Divines.

Teach any new Verity that was unknown to the Apostles. See Greg. de Valentia, *De Fide Disp. 1. Quest. 1. Puncto 6. §. Illud vero.* And §. *Hinc quoque. Suarez Disp. 2. De Fide Sect. 6. n. 18. Tanner. Disp. 1. de Fide Quest. 1. Dub. 7. n. 211.*

What is
meant by
the Ana-
logy of
Faith.

2. *S. Paul* Methinks confirm's this Doctrin, *Roman. 12. 6. According to the Rule of Faith*; Whereupon our Sectaries, Because the Greek reads *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*, Endlessly talk of the *Analogy of Faith*. Let us bring Words to Sense, and Sense to Principles. What is This *Analogy*, This *Measure*, or *Proportion* of Faith? Is that, which every Mans private Fancy fall's upon to be Faith, the *Measure and Analogy of it*? God forbid. If so; Faith would be as Various, as Fancy is Changeable in Hæreticks. We must therefore find out a better *Analogy*. And if you say it is Scrip-

A perfect
Rule of
Faith, be-
fore Scri-
pture was
writ.

pture. I Answer. Before the writing of Scripture, There was a true and perfect Rule of Faith, Otherwise These words of *S. Paul*, Presupposing the Rule He mentions before he writ This Epistle, are insignificant. Again. When He Tell's the *Thessalonians Epist. 1. c. 1.* of Their being a *Pattern to all that Believed in Macedonia and Achaia: Of the Word of our Lord founded out by them in every place: Of their Faith Spread abroad &c.* What Think ye, was this not yet written Word of our Lord, or the true *Analogy of the Thessalonians Faith*, As well Dilated as Approved of? What Finally was that *Form of Doctrin* commended in the *Romans cap. 6. 17*? Why Did the Apostle blame the unsettled *Galatians* for Being so soon Transferred into another Gospel, and Denounce *Anathema, cap. 1. 6.* if they believed an Angel Preaching contrary to his former Doctrin? All these
and

Scripture
proves it.

and many other Passages of Holy Writ manifestly De-
 clare, That there was Divine Doctrin Taught by the
 very Founders of Christianity before the Writing of
 Scripture. There was a Plat form of Christian Re-
 ligion made by the very Apostles before they Sepa-
 rated Themselves, and began their Preaching to several
 Nations. And to comply with this Rule or Form of
 Faith, Blessed *S. Paul*, Though full of the Holy Ghost,
 went to confer with *S. Peter* and the rest *Gal. 2. 2.* *Act.*
 15. 36. Upon it, The Apostles Held Councils, yea,
 and as some Grave and Learned Doctors Affirm by the
 Measure therof, the Holy Scriptures were written.
 Se the notes on the Rhems Testament, *Rom. cap. 12.*
v. 6.

Before the writing of Scripture there was a plat form of Christian Religion.
Councils held upon that plat-form, and Scripture writ.

3. Be it how Sectaries will : There was Faith in the
 World before written Scripture. The Apostles who
 taught it, Had their Rule of Doctrin prescribed by a
 good Master the Holy Ghost, for they Taught not
 Christian Doctrin upon their own frail Iudgements
 (considered as Men.) No, they had ever the Gui-
 dance and Direction of this Blessed Spirit with them,
 and as His Instruments Delivered so much as this Ma-
 ster (according to *Christs* Promise) gave Assistance to,
 and neither more nor less. Now, those Pious Chri-
 stians who heard this Apostolical Learning, made it
 most certainly *Their Rule*, *Their Measure* of Faith,
Their analogy, and *Form of Doctrin*. Whence I argue
 This Form or Rule of Oral Doctrin First laid up in
 the Brests of the Apostles, and afterward Delivered to
 different Nations, was neither All set down in Holy
 Scripture (for Volumes would not contain it) nor All
 intierly lost, 'Tis pittie such a rich *Depositem* should Be-
 O o 3. rish,

The Apostles had their Rule of Doctrin from a certain Master.
The first pious Christians had their Rule from the Apostles.

*That Do-
ctrin is yet
preserved in
the Church.*

rish, Therefore, it yet Remains somewhere in safe Custody, But no Place is fitter for it, then that which the Fathers call *Theaurarium* drives, the Rich Treasury of the Church : where 'Tis still Preserved, and Those *Timothies* (I mean those *Evangelists*, Those *Pastors*, Those *Doctors* mentioned *Ephes. 4. 11.*) Appointed by Providence to Edify the *Mystical Body of Christ*, The Chief Preservers of this *Legacy* and *Noble Depositum*, are as Necessity Requires, 'to impart it and make it known to the World by their Definitions, Least like Children we be carried away with every Wind of fals Doctrin.

*The
Ground of
Tradition.*

and herein lyes the very Ground of all *Apostolical Tradition*. This is not mine, but the Great *Vincensius Lirinensis* own Doctrin now cited. Where pondering that of the Apostle : *O Timothy Keep thy Depositum* ; He Asks, *Quis Est bodie Timotheus, nisi vel universa Ecclesia, vel specialiter*

*The whole
Church, or
Rulers of
it preserve
this De-
positum.*

totum corpus Prapositorum &c.? Who is now, or, at this Day our *Timothy*, But either the *Universal Church*, or more, specially the *Whole Body of those Guides and Rulers set over it*, that are themselves to have the insire knowledge of *Divine Worship*, or, to infuse it into others &c. ? Afterward: *Quid est hoc Depositum?* What is this *Deposited Doctrin*?

*The
Church no
Author but
Keeper of
Divine
Doctrin.*

He Answers : *Id quod tibi creditum est* : 'Tis that which is committed to Thee, not that Thou *Invent's*, that which thou hast Received, not what Thou hast Fancied of thy own Head. It is a thing not of Wit, but of Doctrin. Non *usurpationis propria*, not of thy *Private Use* ; *Fashion*, or *Practise* ; *Sed publica Traditionis*, But of publick and known Tradition, brought to Thee, handed to Thee, wherof thou art not to be Author, sed *Custos*, But a *Keeper* and *Preserver*. Then he goes on : *Depositum Custodi Catholica Fidei Talentum &c.*

4. And thus you Se, we have a Church, a Catho-
lik Talent of Faith committed to it. *A Depositum of*
 Apostolical Doctrin laid up in its Treasury. We
 have a Moral body of *Timethies*, of *Teachers*, united
 with one *Supream Head and Pastor*, That Assures us mo-
 re-Explicitly by its Definitions what the Ancient De-
 posited Doctrin is, And Reclaim's us if we swerve
 from it. We have Express Scripture, that both
Proves and approves the Churches Proceeding in Doing
 so, And this Sacred written Word faithfully Inter-
 preted, And the unwritten *Deposited Word* also most In-
 fallibly Proposed, is our *Form*, our *Rule* and perfect Ana-
 logy of Faith: O, Had Sectaries but Half as much
 For what They boldly Assert contrary to us. (And
 because every Man is a Church with them, They
 Define more then our Church Defines.) *The Con-*
secrated Host is Bread only, a Figure of Christs Body
only. There are two Sacraments only. Works Iustify not,
but Faith only &c. Had, I say, These men but half
 so much Authority for their Definitions, How would
 they warble out the Notes of their Novelties? But
 God hath Silenced them; For they have neither Church,
 nor Scripture, nor *Ancient Depositum*, nor *Tradition*,
 nor *Analogy*, nor *Rule of Faith*, nor *Motives to Make*
what They Define probable, nor Any other Thing to
 talk of, But of a meer Nothing, I mean the Nullity of
 Their unproved Negative Religion.

5. What hitherto is said of Catholick Definitions
 made by Pope and Councils, Chiefly Relates to such
 Matters as have been Anciently without Dispute Revealed,
 yea, And believed also, Though not perhaps in or-
 der so all so Explicitly. And this way of Defining,
 some

*Principles
 wheron the
 Church
 proceed's.*

*A Mystical
 body, of
 Teachers,
 Gods writ-
 ten and
 unwritten
 Word,
 Sectaries
 want all.*

*Protestants
 have no
 Authority
 for their
 Definitions.*

*Talk only
 of a Nulli-
 ty, and an
 unproved
 Negative
 Religion.*

*One way
 of Defi-
 ning.*

Gods un-
written
Word of
equal Au-
thority
with his
written
Word.

Señaries
ill Conse-
quences.

some Divines call *Propositionem*: That is, a *Reproposing* of *Mysteries* formerly *Believed*, whether clearly *Deduced* out of Gods Word, or drawn from undoubted *Tradition*, 'Tis the very same: For, as the *Oral Taught Doctrin* of the Apostles was, and is certain as *Doctrin Registered in Scripture*; so all that really is Gods *Unwritten Word*, when proposed to us by the Church as such, is in *Substance* of equal Authority and Credit with the *Written*; For, *it is not the setting down of Truths in Volume or Parchment that Add's more Weight to them, or makes them higher Verities*. And here by the way, I cannot but Reflect on the inconsequent Proceeding of Protestants, who must Trust our Church for the *Handing down* to them Gods *Written Word*, whilst most *Unreasonably* They Reject Her Authority, when she Declares what the *unwritten Word* is. I say, *most Unreasonable*, For if it can Deceive in this later, it may as well have deceived Christians in the first, and given them fals Scripture. Wherof see more in the second Discours.

Another
way called
by Divines
*Affevera-
tion*.

6. 'Tis true, There is Another way of Defining called by some Divines *Affeveratio*, or, The Asserting of a Truth, not so *Explicitly at least Believed before* (as when the Church Defines against open Hæreticks what was Antecedently of Faith.) And Herein the Church Proceeds, not so much upon a Previous Known Act of Faith, as upon the General Owned Principles of Catholick Belief, wherunto Theological Discourses drawn from sound Divinity, And other Principles, partly Evident, and partly in a high Measure Morally Certain, have Access, And are most Prudently joined, *Not That the Definition in it self, Relies on those*
lower

lower Principles, But on Gods Gracious Assistance ever with his Church in the Delivery of Truth. However, Providence will have this way followed, as a Vusual and Necessary Condition, Because men of Reason, in so weighty Matters are not (as Sectaries do) to Define at random, but industriously to use Reason, And Proceed on rational Principles. But This belongs more to Divinity, then to Controversy: For I think the Church never yet Defined any thing against Hæreticks, that was not Antecedently a known and owned Truth of Faith, Though not so fully expressed, as it often is, by the Churches clearer Proposition. Thus we say: The Real Doctrin of Transubstantiation is as old as the Doctrin of The Trinity, or the Consubstantiality of the Son with His Eternal Father, *Though the Words Expressing these Mysteries more significantly and clearly, are of a later Date.*

The Real Doctrin of Transubstantiation as old as that of the Trinity &c.

7. Now to the Objections. And one Hinted at above is. The Church was solidly Founded in the Apostles time in all Things necessary to Salvation. Therefore *These Post-nate Definitions* of it are to no Purpose. To confirm This, Our young Antagonist Ask's; *Whether the Apostolical Declarations of the Ancient Primitive Faith were lost in the intermediate Ages, or no? If not lost, Shew them, saith He, And There is no Need of new Definitions.* If they were lost in their Passage down, the Church now wants them, And therefore can Define nothing. Were the Play worth the candle, I might here Demand of Protestants whether Their Declared Sense, *This is a Sign of my Body Added to Christs Words, This is my Body*, which Sense They suppose to be Apostolical, was lost in the intermediate

An Objection.

Of Apostolical Declarations lost.

is restored.

Ages, or no? If not lost, shew us that Apostolical Declaration, and 'Tis enough. (But this is impossible.) If it was lost (or rather never in Being) How dare *Sectaries* make such a Declaration on their own Heads without Producing the Apostles Warrants? I Answer briefly to the Objection. The Church then was solidly Founded just as 'Tis now, the Doctrin is one and the Same, And every Article of it was ever, and is now still either explicitly, or implicitly Believed; Yet, These new Declarations are Necessary, *Because the Proposition of a Doctrin sufficient in one Time, or Age, Serves not for all Times and Ages, when New Difficulties occur, And Haresies rise up against it.* The Church therefore ever vigilant, and Desirous to quiet all, speak's Again more clearly the old Received Verities, Cautiously too often Bogled at by *Sectaries*. I say, more clearly, For, 'tis one thing to Assert: Such a Verity is not at all contained in Scripture, or in the Ancient Deposited Doctrin of the Church: And another, To say it is so clearly There, That in order so to us and different Circumstances, it needs not at all a further Declaration. *Sectaries* continually Declare Their Sense of Scripture (For They have no other Deposited Apostolical Doctrin to Talk of) And why may not the Church, Authorized by Christ, with Better Reason do so too? To what is Added to Help on the Objection, I have answered. The Deposited Doctrin Orally Delivered without writing is not lost, But still remain's in the Churches Treasury: 'Tis, as it were, Handed down from Age to Age, and Inseparably accompanies the Church through all Ages, is securely preserved, or Coffers) as securely as if't Had been engraven in Brass

*The Answer.
The Church was solidly founded as 'Tis now. That which is sufficient in one Age Serves not always.*

Different Circumstances require clearer and more ample Declarations.

Deposited Doctrin, following the Church through all Ages, is securely preserved.

Brass or Marble. And Seditaries must say thus much, Seditaries must grant this. if They own Scripture for Gods Word. For, are not They now as well Assured upon the Churches Testimony, or *Unwritten Tradition*, That *st. Iohns* Gospel was Indited by the Holy Ghost, As if the Church produced a Hand-writing to Evidence that Verity? Yes most Assuredly. Whoever therefore Dare call into Question the Churches Authority Asserting a Doctrin, Though it Produce no *Manual Writing* For it, Their urging for a hand writing of Apostolical Doctrin is proved frivolous. May as easily Doubt (if it show you One) Whether that very Exhibited Evidence be Authenticall, or no. Let us only I-magin that the Apostle, that writ the last Part of the New Testament, had exactly set down the whole Canon of Scripture, which the Church now Receives. Let us Suppose again, That very copy to be left in the Hands of some Pious Christians Living in those Days, and so long Preserved, Vntil After Hareticks excluded from the Canon such and such Books of Holy Scripture, as *Lusber* lately Did *St. Iames* Epistle. No hand-writing distinct from Scripture is comparable to the Churches own Authority. Both they, and *Lusber* might more Rationally have doubted of that very Written Instrument, then any can now Doubt of a whole Churches Authority, owning the Canon of Scripture to be as it is. No Charter Therefore, no written Instrument, Though once truly made, when the Author is gon, can Parallel the Churches Testimony in what it Asserts. The Reason is: Because a Manuscript only Tell's you what The Reason. it Contains, but, not *Whose it is*, and though it did so, Men might yet question the Forgery of it, unles an Authority beyond Exception (extrinsecal to the writing) take away all Fear of Cozenage, and make it Undoubted. This Reason proves Tradition surer then any Manuscript. This Reason proves Tradition Necessary in the Church as well for the owning of Scripture, as other Verities.

*These men
would have
They know
not what.*

8. I have said thus much to show How neer to a Piece of Non-sense our Adversaries Draw, when, To Cancel the later Definitions of the Church, They urge us to produce the old Apostolical Declarations, whereby these later Definitions are proved Authentick. Can you Imagin what They would be at: Would they have an Authentick Attestation, to prove what the Church hath Defined ever since the Apostles Time, is the Ancient Apostolical Doctrin? The Church Tell's Them it is so, but That's not enough. Would they have a Register Distinct from the Churches Declaration containing the Summ of all Apostolical Doctrin? Yes sure this They seek for, *if their Demand of having the Apostles Declarations shewed them carry Sense with it.* For example, we must shew them by some written Record more Ancient then all the Definitions of the Church are, That the Apostles held a *Purgatory, Transubstantiation, a Sacrifice &c.* Or, at least Prove these Doctrins to be grounded on undoubted Received Tradition. I have answered. Suppose the Roman Catholick Church (And here we speak of no other, For I hope Sectaries will not urge us to shew Them writings Received from Ancient Hæreticks) should Produce a Record containing a Summary of Apostolical Doctrin, *Our Adversaries might more justly except against that as an old unproved Legend, then They are now able Rationally to except against the Churches Definitions:* Because such an Imagined Record must either be Approved by as great an Authority as the Churches is to gain it Credit, or by a Greater. There cannot be a greater in this present State of Things, then the Churches own Authority; But Sectaries Reject this Authority when the Church Defines,

*They are
clearly con-
futed.*

lines, Therefore they would much more easily Reject that supposed written Instrument, though it told them exactly what She now Defines is Apostolical Doctrin. As much Therefore as the Church can be supposed to do by the Help of such an Imagined Writing, it can do without it: For if it have Authority to Legitimate, as it were, such a Writing, its own Authority is as worthy of Credit, when it Defines without the Writing. You see Therefore how Unreasonably these men require a Codicil containing the old Apostolical Doctrin, which ought, Forsooth, to be Exhibited and shewed them, Before they can be perswaded that the Church faithfully Proposeth, or Defines a Doctrin to be Apostolical.

The Church can do as much without the Imagined Hand-writing as with it.

9. Now if They be convinced, that, to Require such a Manuscript from us is as Unreasonable, as if we should Press them to produce one for Their late Novelties, And therefore urge the Church to prove her Defined Doctrin by undoubted Tradition. I answer, The Church doth So, whilst They, God knows, Allege nothing like Tradition, for so much as one of their New Articles. And here because we have a fit Occasion, I'll Discover in a Word the Fallacy of Sectaries in this matter of Tradition. I say in a Word, For 't is not my Task now to Handle that Question largely. Thus it is. Sectaries ever suppose, when the Church Defines a Doctrin upon the Tradition of former Ages, it is obliged to shew them, the very Doctrin, in express Terms (Antecedently to the Definitions) owned, and writ down in the Volumes of some one or more Learned Fathers. Whence it is They Argue: No man heard of a Purgatory before St. Austins Time, and Ho

A Fallacy of Sectaries about Tradition.

How Sectaries argue

302 Disc. III. C. VII. *More of this Subject.*

only hints at it slightly; nor of Transubstantiation before the Lateran Council &c. Therefore those Doctrins are Novelties lately introduced. I Answer. Were all this True,

By unclud-
ing Nega-
tives.

The Argument is an unconcluding Negative, and run's limping thus: *Antiquity, or the Ancient Fathers have not Expressed every Defined Doctrin of the Church in the like Explicit Terms as the Church useth, Therefore such Doctrins were not really Received by the Church.* Observe well, From

The Fa-
thers ex-
pres Things
sometimes
one Way,
and the
Church
another.

the want of an Expression suitable to Sectaries Fancy, they Infer the Doctrin was never Taught by Antiquity. Alas, the Fathers had their Expressions one way, and the Church, after mature Deliberation, another (often more significant) Yet, Both Aymed at the same Verity, though differently set forth in Words, as is clear in the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, called by the Fathers a Real Change of Bread into Christs Body, By the Lateran Council, as you here se, otherwise. I say yet Farther. Had the Fathers not at all so much as Hinted at a Doctrin Defined by the Church, the Argument is yet Purely Negative, and worth nothing. But is here all? No. Their Discours upon another Account is highly Improbable. To prove what

Sectaries
Discon-
sider
highly im-
probable.

I say, Do no more, but only Imagin, That Three or Four of the most Ancient and Learned Fathers, Had in expresse Terms Owned and Registred in Their Writings the Lateran Councils Definition concerning Transubstantiation, as received, Orthodox, and Catholick Doctrin, just as that Council Defines it; would Sectaries then have owned it as Ancient, and Orthodox, upon those Fathers Testimony? If they say, Yes, They are

The Def-
inition of a
General
Council gi-
ves Securi-
ty.

Evidently convinced: For the sole Authority of a most Ample Learned Council, is in true Prudence a Firmer Principle, and

and a better Proof to Rely on, If we enquire after known and received Orthodox Doctrine ever held in the Church, Then the very best Assurance, *that one or more Fathers can give Us of it.* For, who see's not, But that the very Definitions of the Nicene, of the Council of Ephesus, or Chalcedon &c. Are more weighty to beget in us a Belief, That, what Those Councils Defined (to be received Truths) were so indeed, Then if twenty other Fathers had Antecedently writ them in their learned Volumes? The Reason is : Because General Councils Representing a whole Church, Spread all the World over, cannot but know more Exactly what Tradition, and the Received Doctrine of Christianity is, Then Private Men can be Supposed to know, *who lived in several Parts of the World, And had no Obligation to Register intirely the Churches Doctrine in every Particular.* Thus much is said, if the Church at any time Defines upon Tradition only : For 'Tis most certain, that beside Tradition, it Relyes on Scripture also; and Hitherto never wanted the Authority of most Worthy Fathers that undubitably taught us it Defined, Though not always perhaps in such Express and significant Words.

Councils Representing a whole Church know more then particular Fathers.

10. Now on the other side, If Sectaries will neither Allow of the Fathers Doctrine, *Supposing it were Express for our Catholic Verities* (as most evidently 'tis in twenty Controversies) nor, of the Churches Definitions Already Declared in Eighteen General Councils, *We are out of the Reach of all Principles, And must leave them to their unsteady Fancies, or wilful Obstinacy, And pity Their Deplorable Condition.*

If Sectaries Reject both Church and Fathers, when they have not a word of Scripture for them,

11. One word now to a Tedious Harange of Ierms, 'Tis a mile long at least, and Wearies one out, before

They are more to be pitied then Disputed against.

Answer to
our Adver-
saries Letter
of Mil-
stones.

fore He run's it half Over! After our Adversary had Talked of Millstones hung about our Necks, of the Popes Supremacy, Transubstantiation &c. He Tell's us: *When the Apostles were sent to Preach all that Christ Commanded; This must be Understood, that the Church had Power to Teach more if She pleased.* — Alas, the Apostles were only Tutors to the Church in its Minority, But the great Divine Mysteries of the Seven Sacraments, Indulgences, Sacrifice of the Mass, were not fit to be Declared till the Church was at Age — What not one Word of Necessary Points all this while? — Nothing of the Church of Rome, nor Christs Vicar on Earth &c? Thus our young Tully Tattles. To Retort his Argument, I might here load him with the lesser Millstones of his Inferiour Negative Truths; For these hang about his Submissive Neck, if He be a Child of the Church of England, And are as numerous as our contrary Positives. But he will say, they weigh little, *Because They are light Negatives.* Be it so. Were the Apostles, Think Ye, so Tongue-tied, so Sparing of their Words as not once to Hint at one of these Inferiour Truths? What not a Syllable Through the whole Bible of two Sacraments only, of no Purgatory, of no Sacrifice, Nor, of a Sort of New Men that were to Peep out sixteen Ages after, and Reform the World? O, were They alive Again, how would Sectaries storm at their Silence, And utter Forgetfulness of These New Nothings, which yet are the very best Essentials of Protestancy, or it hath no Essence. Thus men might Talk. But, *Ad Rem.*

The Apost-
les strange-
ly sparing
of Protes-
tants Do-
ctrine.

12. This whole wordy Argument, is just like Protestant Religion, purely Negative, And brought to its best Sense Draws apace towards Non-sense Thus:
Christ

Christ and his Apostles Declared not to the World These Doctrins of the Popes Supremacy, of the Sacrifice of the Mass, of Purgatory &c. Therefore they are no Foundations of Faith. I first Deny the Antecedent. How will you prove it? Marry Thus. Scripture saith nothing of them.

Scripture speak's more expressly of the Popes Supremacy, than of a Trinity.

I Deny that also: It speaks more Expressly of the Popes Supremacy, And of a Sacrifice, Then of a Trinity of Persons in One Divine Essence, or of Infant Baptism. But let us Graciously suppose, it do not so. Here lyes the Strength of your Objection, which is Improbably Negative. Scripture saith not, that the Apostles Believed, and Taught a Sacrifice, the Popes Supremacy &c. Ergo, They neither Believed, nor Taught them.

The Objection Improbably Negative.

Observe well your Negative. From the not Registering of all in Scripture that the Apostles knew, Believed, and Taught, you infer: They knew no More, or, at least Believed, and Taught no More. Which is as Unlucky a Sequel as this. You, Sir, have not Writ Down in your Rational Account of Piousness All that your Learned Head hath in it, All you Believe, and Teach Others. Therefore you Know Nothing, Believe Nothing, Teach Nothing, But what is Expressed in that Book.

In a Word I have Answered above n. 22. The Church of Christ, that is. The Heirs and Successors of the Apostles with whom the Mysteries of Faith were Deposited, Teach us what Apostolical Doctrine is, and This Positive, Approved by Scripture, And all Antiquity, hath more Weight in it, Then twenty of your weak Negative Discourses.

The Successors of the Apostles Teach what is Apostolical Doctrine.

But we must not Part thus. I said just now. Your Objection Against us is an Improbable Negative; And I Appeal to your own Conscience, whether it be not so? For, can You or any Prudent Man Imagine,

that

*It is im-
probable to
say, all that
the Apostles
taught, is
registered
in Scrip-
ture.*

that all the exact Words, or Express Doctrin. Delivered by the Apostles in their laborious Sermons, when They Preached to Jewes and Gentils; are Recorded in Holy Scripture? No. I may well say in *S. Johns* Sense, speaking of our *Saviours Works*, the whole World, or whole Volumes would not contain them. Therefore All They taught cannot be Supposed to be either lost, or Shut up in Scripture. Take here your own Instance of *S. Paul*, it Vndoes you. He Blessed Man *Act. 20. 20. 21.* *Kept nothing back that was profitable to them, But shewed them and taught them publicly from House to House, Testifying to the Jewes and Gentils Penance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Iesus Christ.* You, upon this Testimony too simply Demand. *What not one Word all this while of the Necessary Points, nothing of the Church of Rome, nor Christ Vicar on Earth?* I might Ask you, Nothing all this while of Infant Baptism, of the Eternal Consubstantiality of the Son with God. His Father? Good, Sir, Reflect, whilst the Apostle spak of *Faith in our Lord Iesus Christ*, He might well have Declared both these now named and many other Particular Christian Verities: I do not say He did so at that Present, But This I'll Defend Against you. *Because Scripture only relates in a General Way what S. Paul Preached, You can neither Probably nor Positively Infer, That he omitted to speak of These, and other Necessary Doctrins. I say in a General Way.* For, Do you think that *S. Luke* Recounts in Particular all the Doctrinal Points, that the Apostle Delivered, when he went Preaching From House to House? Or, can You Perswade your Self that All the Hagiographers put together, have Recounted all the Doctrinal Matters (not one omitted) That *Christ*

*A weak
Inference
of This
Adversary.*

Christ our Lord ever Spoke, and the Apostles Taught upon several Occasions? Pray you ask your Conscience, whether you can Iudge this Probable? If It does not follow that what Scripture relates not, is not to be Believed. not; The Argument. Scripture Relates not those particular Doctrins, wherat you Cavil, (which is yet untrue) *Ergo They were neither Believed nor Taught, is not only a Negative, But an improbable Negative.*

14. To conclude, Let me Friendly ask you, whether this your *Positive Assertion.* *The Apostles never Believed nor taught a Sacrifice, or the Popes Supremacy, Be an Article of your new Faith, or only one of your Inferiour Truths?* If you Affirm the first; You are Obligated to produce *Positive Scripture* for it, And then it will be a *Superiour Truth Revealed by God*, Though, perhaps in your Principles, not *Necessary to Salvation*. Grant thus much, And you too Clearly own Revealed Articles over and above Those, which *the whole Christian World, and Rome it Self Believes.* Now if it be only an *Inferiour Truth*, And not in Gods written Word: *With what Conscience, or Countenance can you Protestants, who Always Pretend to Reclaim us from our Errors by pure Scripture, Venture probably on such a Work, when you have not so much as one Word of Scripture that enables you to Advance a Proof against us?* Relying on these Grounds, and firm Principles, *Sectaries offer to re-claim us by Scripture, and have not one Text to that purpose.*

15. We easily Solve another trivial Objection of *Sectaries*; which is. *Scripture contains all Things Necessary to Salvation, Therefore we need no new Definitions made by the Church.* I might say, much less do we Stand in need of Protestants new Declarations, forced on Scripture, without a Church. But y^ele Answer in a Word. Though Scripture contained all the *Oral taught, Apostolical Do-* *Another objection solved of Scripture containing all Things Necessary.*

308 Disc. III. C. VII. *More of this Subject.*

*Hareticks
make Scri-
pture useles;*

*It may be
doubted
whether
an Angel
could write
a Book so
plain as
other High
Myseries,
which the
vulgar
would not
misunder-
stand.*

*Church-
Doctrin is
repeated
again and
again, No-
we can be
ignorant
of it.*

Elim, and, what ever els is Necessary to Saluation (which is Fals) yet, when we se with our Eyes, that Sacred Book pittifully Abused by Hareticks; not only in lesser Masters (as They account of Them) But in the very Highest Myseries of our Christian Faith; it must needs be a useles Book in Their Hands without an Infallible Interpreter, And therefore cannot Decide Controversies, nor Tell us what is Necessary to Saluation, as I have largely proved, Disc. 2. Nay farther. Some may justly Question, Whether, if a very Angel writ a Book as full of other High Myseries, yet unknown to the World, as the Bible now Contains, And used his best Skill to Express Those Vertties in the most Clear and significant Language Imaginable; Some, I say, may Doubt, whether such a Written Book, left only to the Private judgments of Those whole Multitudes, who now read Scripture, would not be misunderstood in a hundred Passages, if no After-Teacher Regulated the weak Readers of it in Their Difficulties, or did not comply with the Duty of an Infallible Interpreter. Therefore the Bible which is now Extant, And contains the High Myseries of our Faith (often less clearly expressed) much more need's an Interpreter. And, perhaps, the wise Providence of God would have it writ so on set Purpose, that Christians should have Recours to a Living Oracle of Truth; and Learn of it, what They cannot Reach to by their own simple Reading. You will say an Angel can write a Book as clear to all Capacities, as the Churches Definitions are. Very True: What then? That Book only once writ, is left, as we now Suppose, to the Sentiments of private Ignorant Men (as the Bible now is in Their Hands): But God hath

hath provided that the Churches Doctrin be not *only once Delivered*, No. It is Laid forth anew, it is implanted anew; it is repeated and cast, like good seed, *Again and Again* into mens Hearts and Memories by Faithful Pastors and Teachers, *who shall never fail the Church to the End of the World.*

16. A third objection. The Churches Definitions, *Because Men declare them* (and all Men are Lyars) cannot be *Infallible*, and Therefore Ground no Faith. *Contra 1. Ergo*, Neither Sectaries Novelties, Nor the General Doctrin owned by all Christians (of *one God and one Christ*, Because men Teach them, And all are Lyars) may yet be *Fallible*, and *Fals* also. Grant, or Deny the Sequel, you are Silenced.

A clear Conviction of Sectarians.

Contra 2. If All are Fallible, and consequently may be Lyars in what they Teach, why Vent you, my good Friends, So many *Negative Doctrins*, which may all be fals? Truly, if There be no *Infallibility* in the World, you neither ought to Vapor, as you do, with your *Inferiour Negatives*, nor Blame our *Contrary Positives*; For in Doing so, You condemn your own Iudgement, and Advance no Proof against us. Your Fallible Censure (were our Church Fallible) Goes not one step above a tottering Fallibility, And therefore is too faint to Oppose the Churches contrary Doctrin, Though falsly Supposed Fallible. Mark well.

They Condemn themselves whilst their Censure is Fallible.

I must say it once more. *You Fallible men tell me That my Churches Doctrin is Fallible.* Admit of the Fals Supposition, it is yet, upon all Accounts as Good as yours, or as This very fallible Affirmation is; That says it's Fallible, And, if in real Truth it be Infalible, it is much Better.

Our Churches Doctrin, Though supposed fallible, is as Good as

17. One word more. If Any People on Earth ought to stand for the *Infalibility* of a new Invented Religion, The Adversers

Sectaries Confess Fallible of Doctrin.

310 Disc. III. C. VII. More of this Subject.

Why Se-
ctaries per-
secute Ca-
tholicks,
while Je-
ws are
tolerated.

The Reason
is, because
we cannot
believe a
Religion,
That may
be as likely
False as
True.

Mark well
our suppo-
sed Crime.

A wonder
never
enough to
be admi-
red.

In real
Truth we
are persecu-
ted because
we will not
be plain
Hypocrites.

of Professancy (could they Proceed consequently) should
Do it. Why ? They Deprive Men of their Esta-
tes , cast them into Prison, Bannish some, Hang up
others , And All this is Don , Becaus poor Catholicks can-
not in Conscience conform to a Religion that is Professedly Falli-
ble , and Uncertain. Now, if such Cruelty can be
practized on Christians (whilst Jewes , And the worst
of Hæreticks are Tolerated to live quietly) For a Thing,
that's only Fallible , and may as well be False as True , we are
surely at an End of all good Discours, grounded on Christian
Principles. What ? To Bannish us, to Confiscate
Mens Estates, To Shed our Blood, For a Religion That
may be False, when we Believe our Creed, And Profess as
much as these newer Sectaries make Essential to any Reli-
gion of Christians, is , to speak moderately, an unheard
of severity. Yet so it is. They Do not Harraßs us
as they do, Because we Believe in one God , and one
Christ, or own a Doctrin common to all Christians;
For themselves Believe so much. But Here is our suppo-
sed Crime. We cannot Assent to a Religion that may be
False , we cannot Subscribe to a Company of new Negative No-
things, And Therefore we are lashed and Persecuted. Nay
(and I'll tell you a Wonder) our Guilt goes not so High:
For, though we were in our very Hearts Arians , or, As we
are Catholicks, yet, if in the Exterior we do as Sectaries do,
we are still lovely Children of the Church of England. Learn
Therefore this Truth; it is Undeniable. All the Storms
of Persecution Raised against us, Are not upon any
Account of want of True Faith; But , for this Sole
Reason, That we will not Believe one Thing, and Force our
Consciencs to Profess an Other , Which is to say : We are
Handled thus roughly, Because we will not Dissemble with
God

God and Man, and become plain Hypocrites. Herein only Lies our Trespas. *Iustus es Domine, & recta iudicia tua.* Judge you, my God, whether that no-offence Merit's These Scourges.

18. By what is now said, You may easily Perceive, That, when Sectaries seemingly Bemoan our Blindnes (God knows how much of The Grief lies at their Harts) And Tell us, They have Done what is possible to Convert us, to Drive us from Superstition, And Draw us to the Purity of Their New Gospel, They only give Words without Substance : For, to What would they Convert us ? Will They have us Believe the General Received Doctrin of all Christians ? We were Converted to this before Protestants Appeared in the World.

Sectaries cannot say, to what they would convert us.

Do they desire to Convert us to a Belief of their New Negatives ? These are, at most, uncertain Inferiour Truths, no way Essential to Christian Religion. Put the case, by a supposed Impossibility, that our Contrary Positives, were only Inferiour Truths like Protestants Negatives, They might notwithstanding most justly hang in the Ballance with Them, and would certainly outweigh Them, Because a more Ample and Vniversal Church own's Them.

Our positive Doctrin weighed with Sectaries Negatives.

All therefore They can Drive at, when They Pretend to convert us, is, That We carry about Vs, The Exterior form of Protestancy in our Demeanour, Though we still remain Catholicks in Hart, They care not. That is, as I said now, They would Convert us to be plain Hypocrites.

They only care for the exterior form of Protestancy

19. From this and the precedent Discours it follows, That whosoever Embraceth a Fallible Religion, which may be Fals, can neither Defend his own, nor impugn another upon any grounded Principle, much less can He Persecute his

A Fallible Religion cannot defend it self.

his Adversary to Death or Imprisonment, Though He maintain's a *contrary Religion*, in like manner *Fallible*. The Reason hereof is Clear. Because, *The Defense of a Religion That's Fallible, And the opposition made against another* Answerably weak, and *Fallible*, cannot go beyond the Strength of that last Ground whereon the Defense, or Impugnation (ultimately resolved) have their Footing. But, if the Religion be *Fallible* and uncertain, The last Ground whereon the whole Machin (either of Proof, or Opposition) stand's, must needs be A Distastful, opinative Conjecture, Which, without Certitude, or Satisfaction, is as unfit and forceles to Convince another of a contrary Belief, as to preserve it Self from the Scorn and Contempt of him, though he profess no more but a Faith that's *Fallible*. Put the Case, That a Pelagian and a Protestant are hard at a hot Dispute: The Question propos'd is, Whether of these two Religions (we suppose them both *Fallible*) is the better? With what Proof, or Principle can this *Fallible Protestant* Assault his *Fallible Adversary*, when He knows he cannot go one Step further then to what is purely *Fallible*? If he interpret Scripture, that's *Fallible*, if he Quote Fathers, both They and He are *Fallible*, if He cite Councils, the Definitions (with him) are *Fallible*, if He cry up his own Religion as having the *Vpperhand in Probability*, He only throws his single vote into the *Yrn*, which when 'tis examined, comes to no more But his Own *Sic videtur, or Self Fallible Concepts*. And Hence it follows, That, as He cannot Prove his Religion against his Adversary, so He cannot, but must unjustly Persecute him, if he Refuse to Embrace that which cannot be Proved. But most certainly his Proofs go not beyond the Bounds of *Modest* certainty,

Not the Professors of it persecute others.

The Reason is Evident.

A Defender of a Fallible Religion, cannot preserve himself from Scorn.

He can neither convince his Adversary, nor persecute him, but must unjustly.

certainly, and Therefore cannot oblige his Adversary to Believe him. And Thus these two Combatants may wink, and fight to the day of Iudgement, without ending one Controversy, or falling on any Thing like a certain Principle.

20. I'll say here a strange Word, And think it very True. Would A Learned Atheist write a large Volume against the *Existency of God*, or, A Learned Jew against *Iesus Christ*; They might prove as much, by a Roving, fallible Talk, *Grounded on no Principles*, against These great verities of Christian Faith, as ever Protestant hath yet Proved against the Roman Catholick Church. For, Their new Mode of writing is a long, loose, wearisom Discours, without Reducing either Proof for their own Religion, or Opposition made against Catholick Doctrin, to Any Thing like a received Principle. Mark this in all particular Controversies, you will find meer uncertain Conjectures to be the last ground, wheron, either Their Proofs or Arguments Against us stand, most unsettled. Yet it should be Otherwise: For, whoever will venture to impugn a Religion That's Held by the greatest part of Christians Infallible, must strike Home, and Reach to sound Principles Before He Touch it, much less break it a Pieces. Sectaries may say, They are able at least to Defend Christian Religion in General, owned by all the World; For the rest of Protestancy it may go whether you will, *Nec feritur nec metitur*, They are not solicitous. My God are we come to this Pass now? What must all the Disturbance of Sectaries, their Schism and Rebellion made Against a Church, their Glosses on Scripture, And the whole Machin of Protestancy End thus in a Non Probatur, it cannot be

*An Atheist
might say
as much
against
God as,*

*Protestants
can say
against the
Roman
Catholick
Church.*

*Their De-
fense of
Christian
Religion in
in general
is to no
purpose.*

proved? Is that only, now asserted Defensible (to wit the common Doctrin of all Christians) That *precisely taken* is no mans Religion, And Needs no Defence?

21. Some other Objections yet remain; But are all Solved upon the Principles now established. One is. *If every Doctrin Defined by the Church be Fundamental, the Church layes its own Foundations.* Contra: There was Fundamental Faith in the Church before Scripture was writ: Did Scripture Therefore lay New Foundations of Faith, Because it Declared anew that Antecedent owned Doctrin? Thus we Say, the Church Declares the Ancient objective Faith of foregoing Christians, ever implicitly at least Believed, And not otherwise. A second Objection less to the Purpose.

*Scripture
Declared
anew the
Antecedent
believed
Doctrin of
the Church*

The Teaching Church either Believes in that Instant She Defines a thing Necessary to Salvation, or doth not. If She doth, It was Necessary before the Definition newly made; If not, She Defines something Necessary to Salvation which was not before Necessary. To answer the Objection, I might ask whether *S. Iohn* when he writ this Proposition. *The Word is made Flesh*, Believed that Article of Christian Faith before he writ it, or no? If yes, it was of Necessity to be Believed before. If not, He delivered something Necessary to Salvation which was not so before. In one short Word, Here is the solution to No Real Difficulty.

*The Church
Believ's
implicitly
before She
Defines, but
more Expli-
citsly after
for her own
Definition.*

The Church at least Implicitly Believed before, what it Defines, yet may and doth more Explicitly Believe the same Mystery in that very Instant She Defines, Because God Speaks that Truth more clearly by Her Definition. So *S. Iohn* Believed the Incarnation of the Divine Word for His Definition. *Verbum Caro factum*

Hum est. The Word is made Flesh, Though without Doubt He Assented to the Mystery, (and by Divine Faith also) Before He writ His Gospel. But enough of these Forceles Arguments, long since Proposed and solved, which only give a Testimony of Sectaries ready will (to offer at something) and weakness with it (to do nothing.) For, you see clearly, They cannot press us with a real Difficulty.

C H A P. VIII.

Protestants are Vnreasonable in the Defense of Their late Manifest and Vndoubted Schism.

1. **S**Ectaries Are no where more unluckily out of the Compass of Reason, Than in Their Discourses of Schism. I shall endeavor to make The Assertion good in the ensuing Chapters.

2. To Proceed clearly. First, it is most certain, Martin Luther's first Separation, That *Martin Luther*, And His Associates, once Roman Catholicks, Separated Themselves from the Communion of that Ancient Church, which gave them Baptism About the Year 1517. 2. It is as Evident, that our following Sectaries Uphold still, And Stilly Sectaries Defense of *Defend* that Actual Separation made by *Luther*, as a Necessary lawfull Fact, And well Don. 3. It is no less clear, That as *Luther*, when He first began his Revolt from the Church, stood all Alone, without ioyning Himself

36 Disc. III. C. VIII. Protestants are Schismaticks.

*Solitarie
yet stand
solitarily
Alone, not
united with
any Chris-
tian So-
ciety.*

Himself to any visible Society of Christians then ex-
tant in the Christian World ; So, it is now as Mani-
fest, That our Protestants to This very Day, stand
also a solitary Society alone, owning no Fellowship, Union,
or Communication of Lyrurgies, Rites, or Sacraments with
any Church Through the Universal World. They forsake Ca-
tholicks, They forsake, *Gravians*, *Arians*, *Abyssins*, *Ne-
storians*, *Socinians*, and All the rest of Christians.

*The first
Proposition.*

3. My first Proposition. If ever Schism was in the
World, or, can Possibly be conceived, Protestants are most
Evidently guilty of a Formal Separation from all other Christian
Churches, which Denominates them Formal separatists, or,
in plain English, *Schismaticks*. The Assertion is so clear
that it needs no Proof ; For, say, I beseech You ;
If any man in England (now Starting up with a few
Followers at his heels) should utterly Deny our Gra-
cious Sovereign to be Supream Head of that Kingdom,
as also Abjure the Salutary Laws there in Cours ; Or
Finally, should So make Himself and Associates a

*The case of
Rebels in a
Kingdom
compared
with Pro-
testants
Schism.*

Body a part, That all Obedience and Submission we-
re shaken of, Respectively, to both King and Gouvern-
ment &c. Would not this Man, Think ye, Highly
Merit the Title of a Rebel, or (in Civil Affairs) of a
most Uncivil and ungracious Schismatick ? Yes,
most undoubtedly. This is our very Case, Eng-
land, All the World Know's, Once owned The Po-
pe of Rome, not only For the first Patriarch, But Supream
Head of the Universal Church : It Admitted of this Chur-
ches Disciplin and Laws, And yielded Obedience to
Them : It communicated with the Roman Church,
As well in Points of Faith, as in the use of Rites, Litur-
gies, and Sacraments. Yet All These, And, in a short

*What En-
gland an-
ciently
was.*

Time,

Disc. III. C. VIII. Protestants are Schismatics. 317

Time; were Shaken of. *Luther* And our Late men to this Day, make Themselves a Body a Part; And, to Add more to the bargain, as yet, joyn with no other Society of Christians, either in Faith Discipline, or, The like Communion of Rites, and Sacraments. Therefore, if a Schism can be conceived (Define Schism how you Will) This both was, And is still the highest Degree of a plain Formal Schism, and Separation from an Ancient Church, that Ever yet appeared in the World.

*How it Re-
valued
from the
Church,
And yet is
joyned to
no other
Society of
Christians.*

4. To Solve this unanswerable Difficulty, Our Later men are pleased to Play, in a Matter most serious, with a Pretty Distinction, which Intricates Them more, Then they are aware of. First then, Distinguish, Say They, between an Actual and Causal Separation, next Apply it thus, And you have the Truth. We Protestants made an Actual Separation from the Church of Rome (Tis granted) And so are (Though the word is Harsh) the Formal schismatics: But you Papists, are the Causal Separatists; That is, You gave the true Cause of our Parting from you, And Therefore are the Schismatics before God; For Schism is Yours, who give the first Cause of it, And not Thine, who make the Actual Breach upon a Grounded And most just Cause, as We have Don. Thus our new Doctors Discours, But how Unreasonably, We shall Declare presently. In the mean while, You se one wretched *Luther*, And a mean Handful of Followers so pertly Bold; so Audaciously Impertinent; As not only to Accuse a whole Ample, Ancient, and Learned Church, But more, without Power, Authority, or any Jurisdiction over it: You Se Them also sit as Judges in a Cause They Had nothing to Do with; And Then, Inaudita causa, Proceed to a Sentence, And condemn

*Sectaries
play in a
serious
Matter
with an
ungrounded
Distinction.*

*Intolerable
Boldness in
Luther
and His
Followers,
to accuse
and condemn an
Ancient
Church*

318 Disc. III. C. VIII. Protestants are Schismatics.

without
Power or
Jurisdic-
tion.
Such su-
spect'd Ac-
cusers could
not be
Judges.

Amst
Disperate
Fact first
to Rebel,
and then
to suppose
without
Proof,
They had
Reason for
their Re-
bellion.

The very
Method
held in our
Protestants
condemna-
tion, was
Illegal and
contem-
ptible.

The For-
mal Sepa-
ration of
Sectaries
from an
Ancient
Church is
Evident.

it of Errors And Causal Schism. And can Reason, Think ye, Enter here, or ever Countenance such a Proceeding? It is Impossible. Had But a spark of Reason lived in These Novellists, They Ought to have known, that Accusers (so Vnvaluable, so few, and so Rationally Suspected of Malice) Could be no fit Judges in so Grave and Weighty a Matter: They ought to have owned this very Fact a most Desperate one, First, Openly to Rebel, And then without any Other Proof, But Their own Proofes Word, Tacitly to Suppose They had great Reason For their Rebellion. Had reason Regulated Here, They should have Laid forth the sup- posed Evidences of their Charge against our Church to a Third Impartial Judge (They Talk of an Vniver- sal Church Distinct from the Roman) why did They not Appeal to This, And then Acquiesce in some other Sentence and Judgement Better then Their own? But to Accuse so vast a Society of Ancient Christians as we are, And know not WHY; To Condemn it of Error, and know not WHEREFORE; And, This before no other Tribunal but Themselves, who were the Rebels, Savior's so strongly of Sav- cines and Selfconceited Pride, That the very Method Held in the Condemnation, Makes all to look upon it as Naught; Foul, Illegal, and Contemprible.

5. To Prosecute further this most Necessary Point, Thus much I will Say, and wish All may well Con- sider it. It is most Evident, That This Actual Breach with Rome, This Rupture; This Rent, This Rebellion, This Divorce from an Ancient Church, This Formal schism (Cover all as much as is possible under the smother Term of an Actual Separation) is as clear on our Protestants Side, As the Suns shining at Noon-day, like Dirt it lyes at their Doors

Disc. III. C. VIII. Protestants are Schismaticks. 319

Doors, and They will never be Able to Sweep it away. But to Say, That Catholicks laid such Nastines There, or, That Rome caused This Schism; neither is, nor shall be any more, then a meer Supposed Whimsy, An Unproved Calumny, As long as Truth is in the World.

But to say that Rome was cause of it, is a meer unproved Calumnie.

6. Say therefore, I Beseech you, Good Dear Countrymen, Why was the Roman Catholick Church the Cause of your Schism; Why Separated you your selves from it? You Answer. A multitude of Corruptions, of Superstitions, of new Forged Articles in Faith, of Innovations, and I know not what more, made you leave this Church, so Far as it had receded from its Ancient Purity.

What Schismatics allege, as cause of their breach.

Very good. The Charge Drawn up, goes High, And is evidently Hainous. But Say on: Are your Proofs Answerably as Strong, or Equally Evident To make the Charge good Against this Church, Both Accused, and condemned by you? Or, which Comes much to one; Are these Proofs as Manifest To justify your Formal Schism, as 'Tis evident, that you Made it? Such an Evident charge against a Church, and so Tragical a Separation from it, Acted by you, Must both in Law and Conscience Be Supported and Born up by Evidence. The Weightiness of the Matter Requires it. Weak seeming Probabilities, meer crazy and Conjectural Arguments (Atheists Vent such against God and Jewes against Christ) are Here too Slight, and Forceles, Either to Acquit you of your most sinful Formal Schism, or, To make us Guilty of the Cause.

The Question is whether Proofs answer to the Charge?

Or are as manifest to justify that Formal Rupture as 'Tis Evident, it was made?

Weak crazy Conjectures prove nothing.

7. Come therefore, Let us not word it Longer, But go closely to Work. We Appeal to Reason and undoubted Principles in this Controversy. These (and not Talk, nor meer Conjectures) must Uphold your Proofs

8. Come therefore, Let us not word it Longer, But go closely to Work. We Appeal to Reason and undoubted Principles in this Controversy. These (and not Talk, nor meer Conjectures) must Uphold your Proofs

320 Disc. III. C. VIII. *Protestants are Schismatics.*
Proofs, if you have any Against our Ancient Church.
To Proceed Therefore clearly,

*Errors
charged on
our Church
are not E-
vident ex
Terminis.*

*Therefore
must be
proved by
Discours
reduced to
owned
Principles.*

8. Note first, That the *Supposed Errors*, charged on the Roman Catholick Church by Protestants, are not like the first Principles in Nature, Evident ex Terminis, By their own Light. Their Evidence Therefore, if any be, must be laid forth in a Solid and Convincing Discours, And This Discours, if Convincing, is to be Driven on by a Medium, which either by it self is, or doth at last Rest on some Known and Owned Principle; Owned, I say, and Admitted of, not by the One or Other Dissenting Party, But Common to them Both. If such Principles Fail, or the Discours, which is carried on, Derives not Strength and Certitude from Them, The Force of Arguing (turned either into a Roving Talk, or Clamours) is Lost, Becomes Lame, Deficient, and Unconcluding.

*The Self-
saying of
Sectaries is
excluded
from being
a Proof.*

*Protestants
Humor in
Writing
Controversies.*

9. Note 2. Whilst Sectaries, by Imputing Error to the Roman Catholick Church, make it the Cause of Their Formal Schism, They are not to Suppose, That Their own bare Assertion, or, saying, *We have Erred*, can be either Proof strong enough, Or any Thing like a satisfactory Reason in This matter: For their saying is no Received Principle. I Note thus much on set Purpose, Becaus I really Perceive a strange Humour in our Protestant Writers. You have in their Books ('Tis true) Difficulties now and then hinted at, Words multiplied, Much Talk in General, Intricate Discourses carried on in Darknes (And This to Amuse a vulgar Reader) weak Conjectures Enough, now Drawn from This, now from That Vnevidenced Authority, Margents charged with Greek and Latin, And Learned Margents They are, or must be Thought so.

Disc. III. CVIII. Protestants are Schismaticks. 321

To. But after All, you se the main Difficulties wared, you Find Nothing Proved, Nothing clearly Reduced to any other Owned Principle, But Their own Prooftes word, and Bare Assertion: In so much, that I am Apt to Believe (if I think Amiss God forgive me) All that Protestants Aym at in their Polemical Writings, is only to Keep up Talk in the World, And Glory when They have the last Word in a Controversy, whether a Proved Word, or no, it Imports not; so it can be said, They have Answered.

They bring nothing to undoubted Principles.

10. Note 3. If, As we Both must and will exclude the self-saying and Own-voting of Protestants from the Nature of a Rational Proof; whilst They Accuse and Condemn our Church of Errours, They are Necessitated to have Recours to other Principles, And, I think, There can be none better, nor more Free from all Exception, Then These I now Name. 1. Plain speaking Scripture. 2. The Vnanimous Consent of Fathers, Add to These, if you pleas, the Indubitable Definitions of Ancient Councils. 3. Vniversal Tradition. Proofs, which run on in good Form, and Finally Rest on These, or the like Foundations, are Solid, Undeniable, and concluding. If They swerve from such Grounds, They Become both Faint, and Forceles, And cannot But Participate much of Fancy, which we utterly Reject.

The Principles They are to rely on, whilst They condemn our Church of Errour.

11. By the Recours to Plain Scripture, We Exclude All weak and unproved Glosses of Sectaries. By Recurring to the Vnanimous Consent of Fathers, we Highly Except Against an unworthy Proceeding of Protestants, who, if by Chance They meet with a Patch, or maimed Sentence of a Father, which, because Dubious, seemingly Makes for Them, They Triumph, as if the

Exceptions justly made Against Protestants.

S f Victory

322 Disc. III. CVIII. Protestants are Schismatics.

Victory were Theirs. Soft and fair, Say I, There is no such matter: For no Doctrin Doubtfully Delivered by a Father (and 'Tis then doubtful, when it justly may Admit of Different Interpretations) Can Pass For a Received Principle (Principles are clear) Much less hath it force to Blemish the Purity of an Ancient learned Church, whose sole Authority is greater Then can be the Dubious Sentiment of any one Father. And Thus much our Adversaries must Acknowledge; For, Though a whole Torrent of Fathers undeniably Comes against Them (As is most evident in Twenty Controversies, Take for Example that one of an Unbloody Sacrifice Dayly Offered up in the Church, Or the Real Presence.) They Answer (Forsooth) the Fathers were men and Had Their Errours &c. Why then, I Beseech you, when One or Two of Them Speak only Doubtfully in a Controversy (I Grant no more) should Their Authority have force to weaken our Churches Doctrin? Nothing Therefore less, Then The Clear and Unanimous Consent of These Ancient Worthies, truly Pillars of our Church, can be Admitted of as a Received Principle. We stand to this, and the other now named Principles. Thus much Premised, we pass on to the Trial of Protestants Proofs.

The Dubious sentiment of a Father less, then the clear judgement of the Church

Sectaries Reject the Evident Testimony of Fathers, when most clear against them, and fight with a dubious Testimony of one or two Fathers against the Church.

CHAP.

C H A P. IX.

Protestants Cannot make Good Their Charge Against the Roman Catholick Church, Concerning Causal Schism.

1. **T**HE Assertion saith thus Much. *There neither is, nor can be Proof against the Roman Catholick Church, whereby it is made Guilty of Errour, And Therefore none can Reasonably say, That this Church was, or is, The cause of Schism in Protestants.* The Reason Hereof is best laid forth in these Few Words. *Proofs against this Church cannot But Fail, when Received Principles are wanting to Support Them: But Received Principles are Here evidently wanting To Sectaries in Their Charge Against our Church. Therefore Their Proofs must Fail, and Consequently, when they are Resolved, can come to no more, but to meer Proofes Columns.*

Proofs fail when Principles are wanting.

2. To Show you, That all Principles Fail them in This Matter, You shall Se how Ingeniously we Proceed. *We Licence our Adversaries to make Use of all the Principles, which the whole Christian World Own's, as Undoubted.* Will They Please to have Recours to well Grounded Reason, to plain speaking-Scripture without Glosses, to the Unanimous consent of Fathers, or Definitions of Councils

One plain Dealing with Sectaries,

cils, and Vniuersal Tradition? We are contented, And will Acquiesce. All we seek For, is to Exclude Their own *Proofles Word from entring in, as a Received Principle*. You Se here is Liberty Enough, And we Allow it, wihall Petition Them for Almighty Gods sake, That they will Vouchsafe to Deal candidly with us, And take to any One, or More of These now named Principles, and Dispute closely in Form, Either by *Syllogisms*, or, That known shorter way of *Enthymems*.

The Liberty given Them,

Provided, they will Dispute in Form,

By this Procedure we shall se the Rise, and Progress of their Discours, the Validity of Their Arguing, whether it be Convincing, and Finally rest on a *Received Principle*, or contrarywise Lame, and Deficient. Reason is reason to all sorts of men, and Though we are Papists, we yet know well what Reason and Evidence is. May it therfore Pleas our new Doctors to Begin with that Common Principle to us both, of Holy Scripture: Their Argument (if to the Purpose) cannot But be much to this Sense. *What scripture saith is true; But scripture saith, The Roman Catholick Church is at least, lyable to Errour: Ergo, it may err.* We deny the *Minor*, And Expect a Second Syllogism to Prove it, which Shall be more Fumbling, and Proofles Then this very *Minor*, that is Fals. I am so confident of this my Assertion, That I intreat our Adversaries to Go on in Form, And Prove Their *Minor*, (if Their Cause be good the Labour is not great) And let us have the Honor to Answer Them. Again, They may Argue: *What Ancient Councils Desine; And Holy Fathers unanimously Teach is True; But These Say the Catholick Church of Rome Hath Erred, or can err: Ergo.* We here Deny The *Minor* Also, which shall never be

Their Argument from Scripture Ends after the First Syllogism.

And will be as Forcel as if drawn from Fathers,

Pro-

Proved by a second Syllogism either Evidently, or Probably. In the mean while (And let Them Remember so much) Their Formal Schism is not only probable, But Evident, Though the Proofs fall short to Evidence the Pretended Cause of it.

3. Some Perhaps will Say : This way of Arguing doth not the Deed. No. They will go Other-
 wise to work, and Descend to Particular Controversies, And shew us how Council hath Contradicted Council, How Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Praying to saints, worshipping of Images &c. are late Novelties Introduced into our Church. *If they will come to particular Controversies.*
 Here, They Hope to have us upon an Advantage, And With such Doughry Doings, They are able to make our Church Guilty of Causal schism, And Acquit Themselves of the Formal Crime. Observe a Shuffling, And Know; Before we Catholics are like to get a sight of our Evidenced Errors, We must Travel far, And run over All those long Worn-out Controversies which have Troubled the world, And to no Purpose, For a Hundred years and More. However we are Content, May it Pleas our Adversaries first to begin with one particular Controversy, And so closely to follow the Matter by a continued Arguing in Form, That at last, They bring their Discours to a sure *We are willing, may it please them to Dispute in Form, and bring Arguments to Principles.* *Owned Principle.*
 But, I well Foresee (Because Conscious of their want of Principles to ground a Convincing Discours on) They'll not Hear to this Proposition. Therefore to leave Them without Excuse, I'll Propose another way, Which every man shall judge most Reasonable, Let them vouchsafe at least, to Set down Plainly one of *Another way proposed.* Their Protestant Tenents contrary to our Catholick Doctrin. For Example. *Transubstantiation is a New*

Invented Opinion lately brought into the Roman Church. And then so closely to Give us the last and strongest Grounds They have for the Assertion, without long tedious, Discourses that nothing appear superfluous, (Much may be said in a little compas.) Their undoubted scriptures, if any be at Hand, Their Ancient Councils, Their consent of Fathers, Their Ancient Tradition. And, which I highly Value of some Ancient Orthodox Church Authority, Must of Necessity enter here, to Vphold their Assertion if it be Defensible. This Don. I'll Engage to Place against what ever Sectaries Allege, The contrary Propts. of our Catholick Religion; for Transubstantiation; And Add to them, the Testimony of our Learned Church; And, if These put in just Balance, or, compared with the Other, Do not (in the Judgement of every Disinterested Scholler) Quite Outweigh all that Protestants can say Against us, I'll here Promise, never to Trouble them more with Controversies. But, if on the Other side you evidently find These men, after all their Noise of introduced Novelties, so cut of from Proofs, so profoundly silenced, That, They cannot bring to light so much as one Passage of Scripture, nor one Ancient Council, nor, the Vnanimous consent of Fathers (no, nor one clear Sentence of a Father) And, least of All, Any Ancient Orthodox Church contrary to our Doctrin, or, that plainly and positively Defends theirs, You will, I Hope, Bear with me, if I say once more. Their new Opinion Relies on Fancy, and, that I Mistook not when I called this Treatise. Protestancy without Principles. I say that Positively Defends their Doctrin: For, I would have Them Know, Their Negative way of Arguing we Read not (forsooth) of the Word Transubstantiation,

The Authors Engagement.

What will appear by this way of trial.

motion, will, if it Appear once more on Paper, look like an old cast Garment, no less out of Fashion, Then quite worn out to nothing. When this Controversy is Ended by Close *Proofs and Principles*, without wandering into long dark Discourses, We, on our part, are Ready to Engage in Any Other, as shall best like our Adversaries, And will Endeavour, to make this Great Truth known to the world. That *Sectaries*, are as *Unfortunate in Proving their Own*, As *unlucky, in Opposing our Catholick Doctrin*.

4. Beside what is said, Here is another Proof, that shewes They can convince nothing unles Hereafter, They manage Their Cause better then is Don Hitherto. In All Debated Controversies, We Have no more But our Adversaries *Objections*, And the Catholick *Answers*. The evidence of our Errours cannot Appear in our Answers, *For These All along, go on in Clearing us from Their Cavils*. Neither can the Evidence Arise, like a Beam of light, out of the *Objections of Protestants*, Unles They lustily Vainquish us with a *Demonstration in good Form*, Supported by an *owned Principle*, and Force us, and other Intelligent Persons to Acknowledge, That these *Objections* are plain *convictions* of our Errours; wherof there is no great Danger, for We Catholicks Profess, And say it with all candor, That we look on These *Objections* against us as *slight; Trivial, Defeated and worn-out to Nothing*. Be it how you will; They cannot be Supposed *owned Principles* Between us, Unles we are mad, And Grant, That, what our *Protestants Vent and Pose* against us, is *Unanswerable*. As long Therefore, as we give a *Rational Reply* to Their Arguments (And let us have an Indifferent Judge to Decide the Contro.

Sectaries Negative way of Arguing, out of Fashion.

A further proof, of Sectaries not proving.

While we return a Rational Answer, Their Arguments Recede from all likelihood of Evidence.

Controversy, whether our Answers be Rational or no, so long *Their Objections will Recede From Evidence, And Lose the Force of clear Demonstrations Against us. Yet Their Schism is Evident. That cannot be Denied.*

*If a Judge
be rejected,
Controversies
are
Endless.*

5. They may say first. This Recours to a Judge is only a *Pur Of*, And makes Controversies endles, Because They Acknowledge none But Themselves. And, I Answer, This want of a Judge, makes Controversies endles; For seclude a Judge, we may wrangle to the Worlds end, and Stand still at as great a Remove from composing Strifs, as we were when we began Them. Pray you, what do They think, That without a Judge, or clear Evidence, which needs no Judge, we must submit to their wordy Objections, as if Oracles Pronounced Them, when They *Acknowledge themselves both Fallible and Erring men in all they say?* No certainly. *Hitherto Therefore We have no Evidence, yet Their Schism is Evident, Remember That.*

*Sectaries
suppose
what is to
be proved.*

6. They may Reply Again. *It is Plain Perversnes in us, not to see the Evidence of Their Arguments Against our Errours.* Pittiful. I Retort the Argument, And Tell them: It is wors then Perversnes in Them to make That Evident, which Hath not so much as *Probability* in it. Alas! To Talk thus, is *Scholding, no Schollership*, a Clamor, no Close Disputing. Be pleased to Put your Arguments in Form, Unless This be don, it is but Vain to Suppose Evidences which cannot be Proved. *Yet your Schism is Evident.*

*The self-
seeming of
Sectaries
no Proof.*

7. They may thirdly Reply, *Their Objections against our Errours seem at least Evident to Them.* Observe a Strenuous Proof. We urge to have Arguments against our Errours Reduced to *Vndubitable Principles*, And here They

They give in Their own *Self-seeming*, which is *Fancy*, and *Nothing like a Received Principle*. I say therefore They have No Evidence; For, This Works upon all mens intellectual Faculties alike, And equally Neecessitat's Them to Assent. It is true, *The Perversnes of mans Will, may either make him to cry up That For evident, which is not, Or, To Deny That to be Evident which is;* But it never makes him not to se what is clearly Discernable by its own manifest Light. Thus then it is. Neither we Catholicks, nor the rest of the Christian World, ever yet saw any Thing like Evidence in those Arguments of Protestants: Why Therefore should we take Their word For it, Or Believe, that They have better Intellectual Eyes then Their Neighbours? Alas, if an *Arian* would lay Claim to such an Evidence For his Heresy, He might do it upon Fancy, and every whit as Groundedly as Protestants. *No Evidence is yet seen, But the Schism is Evident.*

True Evidence hath force with all.

Neither Catholicks nor Others Ever saw any thing like Evidence in the Arguments of Protestants.

8. They may fourthly Reply. Though they have no expres Definitions of Councils, or Unanimous consent of Fathers Assertive of our Churches Errours (Because all of them Sided with Rome, and were no little Flatterers of that *Sea*) Yet, They Cite Scripture Against us, which is a Principle owned by all. Answ. So do *Arians* Also, and to as little Purpose. But *ad rem*. Produce plain Scripture without your own *un-evidenced Glosses* (which we Reject as *Extra-scriptural*) And put your Arguments grounded on Scripture in good Form, You Shall se All, in the First, or Second *Syllogism* Decaid, Faint, Forceles, And out of all Fashion of an Argument. For Example, you have not one Syllable in Scripture Against our Doctrin of *Transubstantiation*, or

Their Arguing from Scripture is Forceles Against us.

Purgatory, or any other controverted Point ; Therefore Arguments built on Scripture , must needs fail you. All you can Allege is , That the Word *Purgatory* , or *Transubstantiation* is not in Scripture , And you know, no more is the Word *Trinity* and *consubstantial*. O, But the Reality is not in Gods Word. How prove you that in Form ? We Deny it: But Admit it be not, your Proof is Poorly Negative, and without legs runn's Thus: *What Scripture Expressly contains not ; is an Error ; Scripture Expressly contains not Transubstantiation, Ergo it is an Error.* We Deny the *Major*, and give you Twenty Instances to blunt and Dead the Force of it. Go on Therefore to prove That , yet Unproved *Major*. It is Impossible. Here , you will have Them at a Stand , They cannot Advance . However, Grant They Offer at it ; Our Answers still closely Follow Them , And Enervate Their Proofs , as They are Driven on in the Cours of Arguing . Believe it, They Shall be sooner out in Arguing , Then we in Answering : And to Shew you , That I do not vainly Vaunt in Saying Thus much, Let it Pleas our Adversaries to come to a just Trial of Disputing in Form upon this particular Matter of *Transubstantiation* , or, of any other where They Think to have most Advantage, And Press on us Proof after Proof, Till at last They bring us to a *Propositio quiescens* , That is , to an Intellectual Light, which by its own *Clarity Evidentiæ* is self Solid (not To you, or to me, Mr. Poole) But to All Rational men, who know what Evidence is , An now we need not go to School and learn That, For nature with a little Logick, Teaches sufficiently what Evidence is. This Evidence Therefore , drawn out in a close continued Arguing in Form will

Their Negative way of Arguing Proves.

Sectaries are urged to Dispute in Form.

And so bring Their Proofs to an Undeniable Principle.

will Do the Deed, and Show whether we are Foyled, or you Fight Vnluckily. Vnles This way be taken to (whilst you run on in a loos Vnconcluding Talk, And Own No Infalible Iudge to Decide between us) We may stay till Dooms day (which is pittiful) And End our Lives Before we end so much as one Controversy. Study Therefore well For this *Proposio quiescens*, which by the *Evidence of its own Light*, Apparent to all, makes us to Yeild up the Cause. If you can do this, you are Gallant men; if not, Know That your *shism is Evident* (This is the burden of the Song) *But the Pretended cause of it laid on us, lyes yet in Darknes Vnevidenced, And Therefore is Vnjustifiable.*

*The loos and un-
concluding way
of Arguing
in Secta-
ries, is
most inspi-
rid and
Blamable.*

9. What will you say, if a new Zelote of Our English Schism Argues Thus? Most surely, Protestants wise and learned men, cannot All (so numerous as They are) Be Supposed to have made a Bustle in the World about Nothing. They cannot be Supposed to have left an Ancient Church, But, upon the *Sight of great Difficulties*, which frightened many, and Finally withdrew Them from Holding Communion with it longer. I shall Answer the Objection largely Hereafter; Now I only Say: *When a Rebellion is manifest, and Decryed by all Indifferent and Vnconcerned men, The sole Authority of Those who Began it, can never make it Justifiable.* The Case is clear in Civil Affairs: For example, In that ungodly Rebellion raised in England Against our lawful Sovereign; as also in *Ecclesiastical*, Witnes, the *Arians* Schilm Against the Church. These Partisans Authority alone, it is well known was Too Weak, and Insufficient to Iustify either of these *Impious Facts.*

*A known
Rebellion-
in King-
dom, Or a
clear
Schism in
the
Church,
Cannot be
Iustified by
The Au-
thority, or
Abettors.*

10. To that Talk of a *Sight of difficulties*, I Answer:

T t 2

He,

332 Disc.III.C.IX. Rome not Cause of Protest. Schism.

Whoever
leaves an
Ancient
Church for
seeming
difficulties,
may as
Easily
Relinquish
all Chri-
stian Reli-
gion.

It is a spe-
cial Provi-
dence That
Difficulties
are no
Greater
in the
Church.

He, who for seeming Difficulties will leave an Ancient Church, Shall at last be forced to abandon all Christian Religion, which certainly hath its Difficulties: (And, are there none, Think you, against our Protestants Novelties?) I say therefore, supposing we once Digest the hard Mysteries of Christian Faith common to us all: So Few, So slight, so Unvaluable are the Difficulties Against our Church, That when One seriously Reflects on this Churches long Continuance, on the several Councils convened in it, on the different Judgements of learned men, on the various Dispositions of People and Nations, which make it up &c. (All apt enough according to nature to breed Endles Dissensions) He must say, *if a spark of Reason* live in him: *Dignus Dei est hic.* The work of God and a Special Providence *over his Church* Appears in this alone, That Difficulties are no more, nor greater in so long standing a Moral Body, Than those slight ones are, which causelessly Affright our Adversaries. Do not then, I say, Desert Christian Religion Totally, upon the Account of those diffiail Mysteries, it Teaches: You can never in prudence Relinquish this Ancient Church, For *Presended Contradictions* in Councils, for supposed *Superstructurs*, *Innovations* and *such like Trifles*, which (Though stumbling Blocks to Sectaries) are no sooner look't on, then removed, And put away By Most Satisfactory Answers.

C H A P. X.

*The Roman Catholick Church, whilst
Evidence comes not Against it, Stands
Firm Vpon Its Ancient Possessed
Right. This long Possession
Proves the Church
Orthodox.*

1. **S**ome perhaps may Object against the former Discours. We Catholicks do not so clearly Acquit our selves of Errour, Nor consequently *of the Charge in being Cause of Protestants Schism*, as we Rigorously Exact of them to have these Errours laid evidently Forth against us. For, if One should Ask: How we Prove our Church to be free from Errour, and this clearly? Or, That by our Errours we Occasioned not Protestants Separation from us, what shall we say? I Answer. Though we have Demonstrations for the Truth of our Religion (supposing *Christ* once Established a Church in the World) And Can shew This Truth, by a close Order of Arguing in Right Form, Yea, And we will Do it, when Sectaries have Satisfyed our Difficulties; Yet, to Solve This present Argument, We are not Obliged by the Law of Disputation to Prove any Thing, Nor To do more Then only

T t 3

to

334 Disc. III. C. X. No Evidence against the Church, to Stand upon our Guard and Defense.

Protestants
because
Aggressors
are obliged
to prove
their char-
ge.

Their weak
Attempts.

The Church
Purity
and Inno-
cency,

Proved by
a long
Possession,

And Evi-
dent Rea-
son also.

The Reason is. Our Protestants are here the Actours, the Aggressors; 'Tis Therefore Their Task to Prove, ours only to De- fend, which is Easy; if you Mark How strangely in Vain They make Their Attempts Against us. Ob- serve it. After our Church, had stood a Thousand years and more in the quiet Possession of Truth, They Accuse it of Error: After, so many Thousands of Learned and Virtuous men, that lived Holily, And Dyed Happily in it; Yes, And Had Eyes as Quick, Judgements as Deep, and Wills as good to Find out These Errours (Had any been) as the best of Se- claries, yet found none; They, forsooth, Espy Them: After This Church had its Purity and Innocency Signed and Sealed by the blood of innumerable Martyrs, Evidenced by undoubted Mi- racles, Manifested by so many Glorious Conversions wrought on Aliens, Drawn to Christ, And Finally Demonstratively Proved by All Those Illustrious Marks of Truth, wherof we Treated Above, Our Protestants Rise up, And Calum- niate This great Society of Christians, Lay a foul As- perision of Heresy on it. Are not They, Think ye, as Actors, Obligated in Justice to make Their Charge good Against us By Evident Proofs? And, are not We Exempted from all Further Obligation of Pleading, Then only to stand upon our Ancient, Blamles, And Quiet Possession? Believe it. This OLIM POSSEDEO, PRIOR POSSEDEO, is Warrant sufficient, And our Wall of Defense against such weak Aggressors: And yet we Strengthen our Hold with Canon Proof (it is Evident Reason also) *Nemo presumitur malus nisi probetur*, No Man, upon vain Presumption, ought to be accounted Naught, unles Reason Prove him a Delinquent.

2. For Example. Give me a Loyal Subject That hath

Disc. II. C. X. No loosing its Ancient Right. 335

hath Don wonders and great Service for his Prince; That hath Enlarged His Kingdom, Gained Him Friends, Defeated His Enemies, And yet is Struggling, to Do him More Service, *whose Repute was never Stained, nor Fame Blemished &c.* Suppose now, That a little Knot of unknown Men should Offer at some Small or Unconsiderable proofs, And with These Endeavour to Impeach him of Treason, would not the Prince, Think ye, Either Require Evidences to be brought in against so worthy a Subject, or Reject These Accusers as unworthy of Credit? Yes most Assuredly. This is our Case (Though no Instance, taken from Private men, can Parallel the Fidelity of the Church Towards Christ) The Roman Catholick Church (I speak of no other, For there is none) Hath Faithfully Don Great Service For the King of Kings Christ Iesus, It Hath Dilated His Empire Far and Neer, It hath Defeated His Enemies (Perfidious Heathens) Gained him Friends, and Innumerable Servants. It yet Struggles (Maugre all Attempts Against it) to Promote his Honor, and Gain him More. So long it was of an Unspotted Fame, and Accounted Pure without Blemish, Till now at last a Little Inconsiderable Knot of Protestants Impeach it of Treason, and Makes it a Rebel Against that King, For whom it hath Served so long and Faithfully. What then, doth our Lord Iesus, And All Iustice Too, Require of These Accusers But Evidence? Yes, And (if possible) More then Evidence is necessary, to make Their charge good against This Church. It Hath Evident Proof enough of its Fidelity, by its Faithful long Service, By its hitherto Irreprehensible Purity, Allowed for a Thousand years and upward, And Therefore cannot be Supposed a Delinquent upon mere Cavils, or For Things which look like Proofs, But when Examined,

An Instance.

The Church Evidently hath proved her Fidelity to Christ.

Hitherto of unspotted Fame before Sectaries impeachment.

Iustice in this charge requires Evidence, not unproved Cavils.

336 Disc.III.C.X. No Evidence against the Church,
Examined, are no Sooner seen then Slighted, no Sooner Weighed,
then cast away as Weightsles.

Another
Instance
Ad Ho-
minem.

3. Take one instance more (Though none of the
Best, it may yet best serve for Protestants.) Suppo-
se, That another Kind of *Luther* with a few Followers, on-
ce *Protestants*, as These were Anciently *Catholicks*, should
now Separate from the Church of England, and Open-
ly Accuse all the Ministers within that Island of Errour
in Doctrin, of Injustice, of Schism, of Their Forcing
Scripture by Vnproved Glosses, to say what God ne-
ver Spake, &c. The Accusation certainly would be
looked on by Ministers As a Hainous Calumny. What
is to be Done? Would not they, After a sa-
tisfactory Answer returned to the Objections of these
supposed Calumniators, Hold Themselves Vnblemished,
upon the Account of their supposed Ancient good Fa-
me, And (we must now Imagin it) of Their Vnquestioned
Integrity both in life and Doctrin, wherof They have had Pos-
session in mens Opinion for a hundred years Together? Would
they not All Vnanimously say, That, by this very Maxim
grounded in Nature : *Nemo præsumentur malus, nisi probetur*,
None, who had the Repute of an Honest man
is to Loos it, Vnles Evidence com's against Him, And
Blemish his Honesty? Yes, All of them would swear
it. They need not Therefore to Preach to These
Accusers, or, To show By Positive Arguments, How
purely They Teach *Christs* Doctrin, How Innocently
They have lived, How free from all Injustice, How
Their Hearers have hithertho Reverenced them as
Saints, And Laborious Workmen in *Christs* Vineyard.
No. This (were it so) Proves it Self. The very ha-
ving Don Well in the Eyes of All, And so long, Carries with
it

Thus much
is only sup-
posed to gi-
ve force to
the Instan-
ce.

This is also
only suppo-
sed in their
behalf,
though not
True.

Disc. III. C. X. No loosing its Ancient Right. 337

it its own Evidence, And is Argument Enough. Wash then Away the Objected Calumnies (if yet Calumnies) And the Work is don, They are Sound in Doctrin, Clear, Innocent, And Blamles, upon this Fals Supposition.

They are not in Real Truth Calumnies, but Verities.

4. The Application of this Instance to our Present Case, is easy. The first Luther accompanied with a handful of Men Accused not only A Few Islanders of Error, But a Church of a far larger Extent, Renowned the whole World over.

The Application of the Instance.

We have Answered to all Their Calumnies, not one Objection is Omitted; If there be Any new Ones, For Gods sake, let us Hear them. This Don, we stand still upon our Ancients Possession of Truth, and Prepossessed good Fame in Teaching it. These Evidence themselves, And need no further Proof; For This Argument is Good. Once we were Honest men, And therefore are so now, Once Right in Faith, and we are Right still, Vnles Evidence Drive us out of our Ancients Right, and Honesty. Solve then a few Objected Calumnies, The Work is don, we stand upon Clear Ground, which is, The yet Vnshaken Hold of our long Olim Possideo, prior Possideo.

What Evidence it self needs no Further Evidence.

No less then Evident Proofs can Drive us out of our Ancients possession.

5. You will say. The whole force of this Instance comes to one Trial. Viz. Whether we Catholicks Have Already Solved, or can solve as well the Objections of protestants Against our Church, As They are able to Vainquish what ever This now supposed sect Proposeth Against their new Doctrin. If The Parity Hold here, the Instance Presses; If no, It is Forceles. Answer. Here, were it worth the While, We might have Sport, and se How our Adversaries Either Pittifully Beg the Question in what They say, Or Licence Every Man to be His own Iudge, Though he Vent Plain Hæresy,

What So'ever Replies.

338 Disc. III. C. X. *No Evidence against the Church,*
 or Finally Draw Controversies into endless Cavilling.
 Observe it. They say, They can better Solve the
 Arguments of These new Sectaries against Themselves.
 Then we are Able to solve Theirs against us. Is not
 this a meer Proofles *Petitio Principi*? Most Assured-
 ly, Yes. And Mark how It Goes on. Just as pro-
 testants Tell us Catholics, That we solve not, *their* Arguments,
 so these New men stand stiffly to it, and Tell Protestants They
 Solve not Theirs: And They Instance strongly Thus.
 You Think your Selves safe, and all clear For you, when you
 say, Papists Answer not to what you Object Against Them, and
 our Reply is the Same. We are as safe in saying Boldly, you
 Answer not Our Objections Against you. You say, you
 Solve our Arguments, We say, No. Will you be
 Iudges in your own Cause for the *Affirmative*? Per-
 mit us then to be Iudges in Ours, for the *Negative*. If
 you Say Again, you give a Probable solution to our
 Objections; So Catholics Answer you. If you say,
 our Objections do not so Evidently conclude Against
 you, But, That still you are Able to Solve Them *Neg-*
atively, That is to show, They do not force your Vn-
 derstanding to yield to Them; So Catholics Answer
 you, with this Advantage, That They can Enervate All
 you Object *Positively* by contrary valid Proofs, And when
 This is don, Have Twenty for one as learned against
 you (Besides the Infalible Church They Pretend to)
 That Vote and Voice for Them, and Pitty your Folly
 in Objecting. Now, if After all. (Say These new
 Sectaries) you Protestants Blame us for our late Sepa-
 ration made from the English Church, And therefore
 Charge Schism on us, know; That *Clodius accusat ma-*
chos, You Led the Danse, And first Schismatiz'd from a more
Ancient

They beg
 the Que-
 stion.

These new
 supposed
 Sectaries
 Argue
 strongly
 against
 Protestants

Ancient Church then we have don. You yet, Though Formal Separatists, were not the Schismaticks, But Rome that Gave you Cause,) And just so we say. We are indeed the Formal Separatists from you, But your Errours gave us just Cause to Part from you, And therefore the sin of Schism is on your side. And thus, These Two Dissenting Parties may Dispute until They both are Breathles, And stand gazing on One an Other without further Progress, Vnles They bring Their Discours to Vndubitable Principles, or take Recours to some Third Equal Iudge between them, or, Finally Grant, which Evidently follows, That without a Iudge, or Certain Principles, The worst of Hereses may be Defended, if every one may first Accuse his Adversary, And then give sentence for himself: For there is no Arian, no Nestorian, But Thinks well of his Errours, And will, at least, Pretend (as our Protestants do) that his Arguments for them Are not solved.

Their Dispute is Endles, because Neither own's a Lawful Iudge, nor can come to certain Principles.

Every one Thinks well of his Heresy, and will pretend as Protestants do, that his Arguments are not solved.

C H A P. XI.

Of a late VVriters Exceptions Against our Pleading Possession.

1. **I**T is very True, Did not I se the Strain of Sectaries Arguing to be Every where like it self, weak, and deficient; I should scarcely have thought, that a man of parts could Have missed so enormously, as one doth in this Controversy, whilst He gives you hints, of hitting the nail on the Head, and saying much to the Purpose. Thus it is.

Mr. Stillingsfleet.

2. We Plead a lawful Succession from the Apostles times, And a quiet Possession of Truth with it, by vertue of an *Immemorial Tradition*. Our Adversary Tell's us. *The Obligation of Proving lyes upon us.* Of

We are urged to prove, what is by it self, an Evident proof.

If Scriptures were not, undoubted Tradition, would prove, we all came from Adam.

proving what for Gods sake? Marry that, which *Immemorial Tradition* most Evidently Proves; in so much that we are now urged to prove that *Proof*, which is alone its Own most clear Light, and undeniable Evidence. They Proceed here, just as if One should bid me Prove, that All Mankind Descended From Adam (Had we no other Argument to Convince the Truth but *immemorial Tradition*) Because, some (forth) may Imagin, without proof, that God in One Age or other (though they cannot say when) broke of this lineal Descent, By creating a new sort of men from whom we come, and not from Adam, which is Sensles.

For the Very Tradition alone has more weight in it to convince the *Affirmative*. *We all came from Adam*, then, A pure Imagination without proof, to perswade the contrary *Negative*.

Take one Instance, perhaps more pressing, and significant. A Kingdom, or, Commonwealth Proves the Succession of its Monarchs, or Princes, for so long a time, by a Constant Tradition, never called into Doubt, or questioned by Any. Suppose, some Zelots should begin to Quarrel with the states of the Kingdom, And Tell them.

An Instance.

Gentlemen, you are all Mistaken. Believe us. In one Age or other, (though we know not when it happened) The lineal Race of your supposed Kings, Failed. A Vsurper Got to the Throne, by force, fraud, or both, And it was He (it's true we cannot name the man) that brought in Novelties, strange Opinions,

Dange-

Disc.III. C.XI. *Against our Pleading Possession.* 341

Dangerous Maxims, contrary to your Ancient Lawes and Customes. Imagin, I say, thus much, would not these Novellists, think ye, after no Smal contempt, be put to their Proof, or be scornfully laughed at, should they urge the Kingdom to Prove what is proved by certain Tradition? This is our very case. We prove the lawful succession of our Popes, of our Prelates, of our Pastors, and People, by Vndeniable Tradition from *S^t. Peter* to this present Age, And we are now called on, To prove that, which the very strength and Efficacy of Tradition Proves by it self, without more Adoe. A most impertinent Demand. For, if He that Denies the lawful lineal succession of Monarchs in a Kingdom, warranted by undubitable Tradition, must, if He stand to it, be put to His Proof (the Kingdom Proves enough by its immemorial Tradition) Much more are these men forced to Prove in our Case, if they Oppugn the Tradition of a whole Vniversal Church: For the Church gives in Her last and clearest Evidence, when she Pleads undeniable Tradition, No man can require more.

We prove as clearly the lawful succession of Popes, and Catholick Pastors, as Any Kingdom the succession of their Monarchs.

The Churches clear Evidence.

3. You May say First. Beside Tradition, whereby the lawful Descent of Monarchs is Proved, There are also Records at hand, to Confirm the Truth of the Tradition. I Answer. The Church hath as Good Records, wherby she manifesteth the lawful succession of Her Popes, Prelates, and Pastors, as any Kingdom on Earth produceth for the lineal Descent of its Monarchs. Therefore it is you, that must show (And by sound Principles) as well these Records to be forged, or Vnauthentick, as Oral Tradition (which is a Distinct Proof) to be Fals, and Fallible. Both are

The Churches Records, as ample, as any in a Kingdom.

above your Power, Skill, and Learning. Be it otherwise, the Proof Certainly lies on your side. And 'Tis all I Intend at present.

*Records
contrary to
the Church
cannot be
produced.*

*The Obligation of
Proving is
incumbent
on our Ad-
versaries.*

4. You may Reply secondly. The Instance of Monarchs succeeding in a Kingdom, Upheld by Tradition is Forceles, if Contrary Records be produced, and Prove that a Vsurper Got in, and interrupted the right line of Succession. The like, may have been in the Church; when Her Popes and Prelates became Vsurpers, and changed the Primitive Doctrin of it. Mark a Supposition For a Proof, and, withall Observe How you cast the Obligation of Proving on your Self. For, Now it's your Task to Produce These supposed Records Contrary to the lawful Succession we Plead for. Shew them therefore, And Argue by them, or, if you fail in this, as you must Fail, The Tradition from our Ancestours stand s still in its Ancient vigour unshaken, against meer unproved Cavils, and Calumnies.

5. You may Thirdly Reply. That Instance of Monarchs lawful Succession in Their respective Kingdoms, when warranted by undoubted Tradition, seem's good and convincing, because no Man Questions the Right, no Man within the Kingdom Doubts of the Acknowledged Succession. But all is contrary in our present Controversy; For, innumerable called Christians, do not only Doubt, But, expressly Deny that Right, and lawfulness of Succession which we Attribute to our Church, to our Popes, and Catholick Pastors; Therefore, because the party Fail's, The instance is forceles. First a Word *Ad Hominem*. Let it Pleas our Adversaries to Declare plainly the Succession of Their Church, of Their Bishops, of Their Pastors

Disc.III.CXI. *Against our Pleading Possession.* 343

stors, by virtue of any Immemorial Tradition. Let them also Vouchsafe to give in that *Title*, whereby They lay claim to a *Possession* of Truth. What ever is Allegeable for the One, or Other, whether it be Tradition, Scripture, or Fathers, will suffer more *Contradiction from innumerable Called Christians*, then the least Article (if any were little) of our Catholick Faith, Therefore they must Solve their own Argument. The Reason is. If they plead Tradition for a continued Succession of a Protestant Church ever since *Christ*, the whole Christian World, yea, even Protestants themselves, Oppose the Paradox. If Their *Plea* for Pure Protestantcy, be Scripture, They'l meet with as many Adversaries, Having not one Syllable for it in Gods Word. If finally They make a Belief Common to all Christians to be Their *Essential Faith*, None likes the Doctrin. *Both Friends and Enemies, Catholicks and Hareticks, stand against them.* Therefore I say once more, They must solve Their own Objection.

6. Now you shall have my Answer, And I say, An Argument, That Drawes all the Force it has from the *Opposition of Enemies*, (And They were all known Hæreticks, that Opposed our Catholick Tradition) Destroys not only Evident Truths, but also Impugn's *Christ*, and Christian Religion. Atheists make Objections Against God, Jewes Against *Christ*, yea, And the very Instance now allowed of, supposeth some wilful Zelots contrary to the common received Tradition, of so many Monarchs undoubted Succession. You see Therefore, How weak this way of Arguing is. Believe it, There is no one Christian Verity, but hath its Adversaries, Therefore, the Man that will Side with such

Sectaries must solve Their own Argument.

The Argument is solved.

Opposition of Hæreticks no proof against it.

Christian Truths meet with Adversaries. Ho

Op-

*that will
side with
such Oppo-
nents, shall
as last de-
serve Chri-
stianity.*

Opponents, and Cavil also, Because a Company of Dismembred, and jarring Sectaries Do so, must look how He strikes, lest he cut too deep, and wound those, He would not hurt. For at last, He shall be forced to shake of the very name an *Notion of a Christian*. I'll say in a word, what is more amply laid forth *Disc. 1. Chap. 7. n. 4. 5.* We have an Ancient Church against these Scattered Companies of Novellists, A Church united in Doctrin, Against their Iarres and Endles Dissensions. A Glorious Church manifested by such Marks and Motives, as made the world Christian, And these plead against *Their Vnevidenced Opinions*. Finally we have most certain Tradition, *against their uncertain Guesses*. Vpon such Proofs, which cannot be shaken, we stand; Therefore, unless our Adversaries, beside the Multitude of Opponents, bring rational Proofs against our *Possession*, which Rest at last upon undeniable Principles, We are safe, and cannot be Danted. Alas, The meer Number of known Enemies, without Evidence to warrant what is Pretended, Seem's much like unjust Clamours in a Disordered Common-wealth, Loud 'Tis true, but as Senseless as Loud, when Reason ought to have place, and plead the Cause, by Proofs and Principles. Therefore, we Appeal to Principles; may They bear Sway, we are content, if not, We told you Above, Though as many Hereticks rise up against us, As there are Atheists opposite to God, And Iewes to Christ, We Regard them not, if they come Vnarmed, and only Fight by the Votes of their own Scattered and Devided Companies. But enough is said of this Subject, in the Discours now Cited.

*Clamours
of known
Enemies,
without a
rational
Trial,
Proofter.*

7. Here, I'll only Add one Consideration more,
And

And it is to Assure our Adversaries Though, They run to pass't Ages, that is, the whole world Over, and Gather all the Votes of Enemies, either against the Possession, or, the Ancient Tradition of our Church, They only give us a Number of jarring Suffrages, which bound up together, cannot Amount to a weak Probability. *A weak probability, though granted, cannot clear Sectaries from Schisms.* However, Let Truth suffer: Suppose them weakly Probable, is this enough, think you, to warrant Sectaries Foul Schism? Is here Ground enough to Iustify an Evident Divorce made from an Ancient Church, wherein Their Ancestours Lived peaceably time out of mind, Age after Age, without Trouble, and Disturbance? No. All is improbable, For, what ever is less, then Evidence Grounded on sure Principles, will shew it self to be, as it is, a Proofless Cavil Against so long prescription, and immemorial Possession of our Ancient Faith.

8. Some may yet Reply. All that's Said hitherto, Shows only a Personal Succession of Popes, Prelates, Pastors, and People in foregoing Ages, But is far from Proving the main point in Controversy, (They mean) a full and quiet Possession of Truth, which we make so Hereditary to These Popes, and Bishops Descending from St. Peter, That it was never lost. This, They say, is to be Proved. I Answer, We are yet obliged to prove nothing: For, the very Testimony, the Unanimous Consent, the Constant Tradition of our united and learned Church without more, are most pregnant Arguments, as well for the Possession of Apostolical Truth laid claim to, as, For the Personal Succession of our Catholick Pastors. Therefore, unles Sectaries can weaken this Plea by a Contrary Evidence, more strong then our Churches Tradition is (and then the Proving is incumbent on them) we stand firm

An Objection.

When the Church gives in her Evidence, Sectaries are to Disprove it.

upon our *Olim Possideo*, which cannot be shaken. I say by a contrary Evidence, Stronger then our Churches Testimony and Tradition.

Want of
Principles
makes Se-
ctaries Ca-
vils impro-
bable.

Speak now, it's your time of Proving. What have you to Alledge against This sole Consent and Tradition? Is it Scripture? Produce it, And we are silenced, if not, Vouchsafe to Hold your Peace Hereafter.

Sectaries
own Votes
as weight-
les, as the
Arians.

Have you the Consent of Fathers, or Ancient Councils, to make your cause Good against our Pleading Tradition, and the Ancient Possession of Truth with it? No. Examen These learned Volumes you'l not find one clear sentence, favoring your unjust Proceſs Against a Church, That made your Progenitors Christians. What then Remains to Scare us with, But your own-self Simple Votes; and if these Cast, as it were, in A ballance Against our Ancient Possession, can out weigh it, and so Deprive us of our Right, The Arians long since had Destroyed us all; For, Their Votes were as weighty, as united as yours, Yes, and more numerous.

A Few
Proofs
briefly
hinted at,
though we
are not obli-
ged to pro-
ve.

9. Well. Though we are not Obliged to prove, what both Tradition and our Ancient Possession Convince, I'll yet Hint, most briefly, at a few Proofs in Behalf of our just Possession. First, it is an undeniable Verity, that *christ* founded a Catholick Church, And 'Tis as Evident (Sectaries Confess it) that He invested the Roman Catholick Church in an Ancient Possession of Truth. 2. It is an undoubted Verity, that *Christ* never abandoned the Church He founded, For He told us: *Hell gates should not Prevail against it.* He gave Assurance of his being with us to the end of the world. The Church is the Pillar and ground of Truth &c. If there-fore *Christ* stood to his Word, and once established the

Christ
Abandoned
not the
Church He
Founded.

Roman

Disc. III. C. XI. *Against our Pleading Possession.* 347

Roman Catholick Church in Truth; it is Orthodox still; and Preserved in Truth by His special Assistance.

3. It is an Evident Verity, that God, whose Providence never Failed his Church, could not permit this Ample, and Ancient Moral Body of Catholicks to Cheat the world by its pleading a Possession of Truth; if't had none, for a thousand years together, when, (which is deeply to be Pondered) *there was not any other sound Church on Earth, for so vast a time, to Teach Christians the Orthodox Faith of Iesus Christ.* 4. We have our quiet Possession Acknowledged by innumerable Votes of most learned Fathers. 5. And 'Tis a Greater Proof (For nothing, Scripture excepted, can Parallel it.) The Testimony and warrant of this Ample Catholick Society carries with it *own Evidence*, no less, for an actual Prescription, Then for the *Right*, and *Title* of our long pleaded, and enjoyed Possession. And who can suppose that all those Innumerable Professors of this learned Church, by whom this Evidence was conveyed Age after Age, were all befotted or deluded with Errour? 6. And 'Tis an Evident Demonstration. No Ancient or modern Church reputed Orthodox by the Christian World, ever so much as Quarrelled with the Roman Catholick Church, or once

A Truth well to be Pondered.

Questioned the Right of Her Possessing Ancient Truths, delivered by *Christ* and his Apostles, none Censured it, none Condemned it, upon any supposed want of a most just Possession, but only Known, and Professed Hereticks, And to these our English Schismaticks Adhere; with these, And no other, They side. If therefore *The Foundations of our Church were once laid firm by Christ. If He stand so his Promise Expressed in Scripture.* *No Orthodox Church Ever censured us for the want of a just Possession.* *An Inference grounded on these Proofs.*

1714. 1715

X x 2

A 31.

Assistance Fail not the Church, Once Established by him. If God could not permit this great Moral Body to Deceive Christians, by Pleading a Possession of Truth when it had none, And when there was no other Orthodox Church to deliver Christian Verities to the World. If Finally, The Authority of our Church, And the Testimonies of most Ancients Fathers may speak in our Cause, And this Convincing Proof also have place. None Ever Gainsaid our Ancient Possession But know and condemned Hereticks. We may well Hope to silence our Adversaries at present, or, if these Persuasive Reasons, with many other, Insisted on Hereafter, Become insignificant to Their Obdurate Hearts, when They can not speak a Reasonable word Against our Evidences, what shall we Do, But Commiserate Their Condition? You see, How roundly I deal with Them, And say, They cannot speak a probable Word Against These Positive Proofs, Though, (whilst we plead Possession) it is their Task to Prove, who are the Accusers, And Charge Heresy on us.

*Sectaries
cannot Answer
our
Proofs.*

*What They
are to Prove.*

10. Observe therefore. If they say, our Saviour once settled not the Roman Catholick Church in Truth, They are to Prove it. If they say, He violated His Promise, And preserved not the Church, He founded in Perpetual Truth, They are to prove it. If They say, We misunderstand the Scriptures now cited, They are to Prove. If They say our Catholick Church cheated the world for ten whole Ages together by pretending Possession of Apostolical Verities when it had none, They are to Prove. If they say our Church was once Sound in Faith, but failed Afterward, They are to Prove, And withal, Distinctly to point at some other Orthodox Christian Society, that succeeded

Disc. II. C. XI. *Against our Pleading Possession.* 349

ceeded in the place of the Roman Church, now (falsly) supposed Fallen into Error, And This will give Sectaries work enough. Again: If They Slight The Authority, and Testimony of our Church, Evidenced by most glorious Miracles, And other Illustrious Marks of Truth, They are to give, in Lieu of that, a more Valid Testimony, a stronger Authority For Their Pretenses, which is impossible. If Finally, They Talk of any Orthodox Church, That plainly Censured, or, Condemned the Roman of Error and Heresy, (And Herein we Urge Them to speak to the Cause) the Proof lies still on their side: or, if they Prove not. Believe it, our OLIM POSSEDEO, is impregnable; The Prescription, and clear Evidence of a long quiet Possession; are our wall of Defence, not to be battered, or Beaten down by Calumnies.

11. Thus much premised. You shall se in Brief, How all comes to Nothing, Wherwith This late Writer too weakly Oppugn's our Ancient Possession, who, After His Telling us *Part 3. c. 5. Page 627.* That the Proof lies upon us. He gives this Reason, And let it be His first Objection.

The Objections of our Adversary, shew'd forceles.

12. They who Challenge full and quiet Possession, by vertue of immemorial Tradition, and succession from Their Ancestours, ought to produce the CONVEYANCE of that Tradition from him, who alone could invest them in that Possession. Mark these Mysterious Words. Ought to produce the Conveyance of that Tradition from him &c. What signifies This? Had He said. They ought to Produce a Conveyance, warranting the Possession of Truth to be in their Church, we would have sent Him back to the Proofs Already Alledged, And Here only Insisted on our Tra-

The Efficacy and force of Tradition, dition: But to Demand for a Conveyance of our *very Tradition*, which is either by it self, its own most manifest and clear conveyance, or must be proved by another clearer Tradition, (And so in *Infinisum*) Tends, Methinks, a little towards Non-sense. Truly I know not what the man would be at. Would He Have us, Think ye, to Produce a Letter written by *Christ*

No Charter or writ stronger then Tradition, *Iesus* (for, Conveyance Here must Signify; *Charta*, or, *Instrumentum*) wherby it may Appear, that the Tradition of our Church is Sound and Orthodox? This would signify just Nothing: Becaus Sectaries might more justly Cavil at such a writing, And say it is Forged, Then they can now Except, against the greatest Testimony Imaginable of a whole Learned Church that must Give Credit to *this Writing*, if't have Any

The Reason, Therefore, He who can Doubt of this Attestation of a far Extended Church, May more Rationally Doubt of the *Writing it self*, Though it were now actually laid before our Eyes to Read. See more of This Subject Above *chap. 7. n. 7. 8.* Perhaps, our Adversary will say we are to produce Scripture, if not for The Conveyance of our Tradition, at least for the Possession of Truth we pretend to: I Answer, This is now Done, *n. 9. 10.* where I Tell you that *christ* founded the Roman Catholick Church in Truth; And promised to be with the Church He Founded to the End of the World: Withal, that no Orthodox Church Ever opposed this just Possession &c. It therefore lyes on our Adversaries to Disprove These Scriptures, And to Weaken those Reasons by sound Principles, or, at least to Offer at an Answer, which, I Think, will be Difficil to Do by Any Proof. That's weakly Probable.

Our Proofs are Already given,

2. 11. b

Ex 2.

13. In

Disc II. C. XI. *Against our Pleading Possession.* 351

13. In the *Interim* you se the Strain of Sectaries Writing Controversies. It is Ever to be Cavilling at our *Tradition*, at our *Possession*, and *Prescription*. And Thus they run on as if their Cause were not at all Concerned, Though it should be otherwise; For, do not Protestants as wel pretend to a *Possession* of Truth, as Those They call blind Papists? Yes. And will They not say, that the Truth they Lay claim to, is either a Belief Common to all Hereticks, or, the Particular Doctrins of the English Church? Yes, For they'l have no Mixture of Popery with it. Well. Now we Urge them to produce a *Conveyance From Him alone* But can who could invest them in the Possession of Either the One, or other Doctrin. *who could invest them in the Possession of Either the One, or other Doctrin.* Here You'l have them Silent, For, not so much as a Syllable of Scripture, nor one clear Sentence of a Father, least of All, Any Ancient Tradition, Ever Favoured such Extravagancies. However, you must have patience, And Hear Sectaries Loud in Their Complaints Against our Tradition and Ancient Possession, And 'Tis no wonder; For, 'Tis easier to Cavil at Truth, Then to speak sense For Falshood.

14. A second Objection. It is Plain in this Case (*viz.* Of Prescription, or Possession) *The full Right depend's not upon meer Occupancy*; But; a Title must be pleaded, to Shew that the Possession is *Bona fidei*; so that the Question Comes from *The Possession*, to the Goodnes of the Title. Answ. By This Word, *Right*, or, *Title*, I understand a just and meet Reason, Allegeable For that, wherunto a man layes Claim, And, wherof He had Possession for long a Time. As if One should Ask an Ancient Gentleman by what Right He Hold's His

The Strain of Sectaries writing Controversies.

Protestants pretend to a Possession of Truth.

But can produce no Conveyance from him that could invest them in it.

What's meant in this place by Right and Title.

His

*Cavils
Against
known
Right
Proofs.*

*The
Right and
Churches
Title.*

*The Heirs
and Pro-
fessors of it.*

*It's tacitly
supposed by
our Adver-
sary an Oc-
cupancy,
but not
Proved;*

His lands; And How long He hath Had Them? He Answers. They were settled on Him by His Ancestours, (And here is His Title.) Both they And He, have quietly Possessed Them, without Cavils, for a thousand years &c. Suppose now, A wrangling Lawer should Tell the Gentleman. Sir, what ever becomes of your long Possession, I Question your Right, or Title, And therefore say, your Possession is not *Bona fidei*. But a meer Occupancy. Would not This busy Fellow, think ye, if He said no more, be put to His Proof, when the Gentleman shewes His Right, and justly plead's his long Possession? Yes, most Assuredly. Here is Our very Case. It is more certain, that the Roman Catholick Church was Once most lawfully invested in the possession of Truth by the Gracious Goodnes of Him that founded it, (Then ever Any was lawfully settled in Right of His lands) For so much the whole World, and Sectaries also Acknowledge, as undoubted: And Here is The Churches First Right, or Title. It is Again most Evident, That Innumerable of unspotted Fame, of Great Learning, Sanctity, and Vertue Have not only Avouched This Blessing to be once Conferred on the Church, But Moreover, have professed Themselves, to be Heirs of this Ancient Right, And so Far, the Professors of Those Primitive Verities, That They conveyed them Age after Age to Posterity (I say No more yet, *but only what they Professed.*) Now Starts up a Minister, And Tell's the Church. (just as the Lawer Doth the Gentleman.) *She bath no Right, nor Title*, But a meer Occupancy, That's no Possession. The Church proves this Right first to have been Conferred by one that

Disc. III. CXI. *Against our Pleading Possession.* 333

that could give it. Then She shewes it, to have Remained with Her in Every Age By sure Witnesses of Vertue and Integrity. Must not therfore this Minister, Think you, that Contrast's with such Witnesses, And Encounters such an Army of old Tryed Souldiers be put to His Proof, and Fight lustily by Evidence, And, if possible, with Stronger Proofs? Is All manfully Don (Pray you Judge) when He wholly supposeth, what Should be proved, And is pleased to Miscale our Ancient undoubted *Rights*, our just *Title*, and Vnquestioned *Possession* by a new Coyned word of *Occupancy*; Let him Keep the *Occupancy* to Himself, and Apply it to His Protestant Religion, That Hath neither Right to plead by, nor Title, nor any Ancient Possession.

15. A Third Objection. If we plead Possession by immemorial Tradition from Ancestours, many things are to be Contested, and this is one, That no Antecedent Law hath determin'd Contrary to what we challenge by vertue of Possession. Very Good. When you, Sir, Shew us this Antecedent Law, *Contrary to what we Challenge by vertue of our Possession*, wee'l yeild. But you are to make this Evident, And, Consequently the Proof Lies on you, which will be a hard Task, For we Know, There is no such Law against us.

Our Adversary is to Show an Antecedent Law contrary to our Possession.

16. A fourth Objection. *Christs* Law hath Determin'd Matters of Difference between us one way or other: For Example, Whether the present Church be Infallible, or no. If the Law has Determined Against us; Possession, And Prescription signify Nothing, If for us, The Question must be wholly *Removed from the Plea of Possession*, And be tryed on This

Y y

Issue,

The Legis-
lators De-
termina-
tion.

Issue, whether Christ by his Law hath determined on your side or Ours. I Answer. The Legislator hath most plainly Determined for the *Infallibility* of that Church when He founded, And though you slight those Sacred Texts, *Super hanc Petram. Pasce Oves. Ero Vobiscum*, or what Els you pleas, They are yet Vigorous Proofs Against your meer Cavils. Therefore, Because you Offer to be Tryed upon this Issue. Whether Christ hath Determined for you or us, we Accept of the Challenge, And are ready to Dispute by Scripture only. Produce then your Texts, as plain and significant for the *Fallibility* of the Roman Catholick Church, Once Confessedly True, As these now Hinted at, and many more Cited Above, are for Her *Infallibility*. This don you may Vapour as much as you Pleas, And Offer to be tryed by Law, &c. But we know your Want; you have not, after All this Talk, a Syllable of Scripture Against our Churches *Infallibility*. Now, to the other Horn of the Dilemma where you Say, (if Christ's Law has Determined on our side, the Question must be removed from the Plea of Possession, and be tryed by the Law.) I Answer, It's a strange Piece of an Argument, And say, it must *not be removed*, Vnles you can Show by your Logick, That, when A Man hath two Good Proofs for a Verity, He ought not to make use of both, but, is to Content Himself with the one only. Thus it is. We prove the Churches *Infallibility* by significant Scripture, as a *Possessor Bona Fidei* proves the Right to His Lands by his Ancient Writings. And, as He Add's to His Writings, a just Possession: So we plead Also Possession in our Case, Why therefore should we throw Away this second proof taken from Possession,

We like our
Adversaries
Offer.

Scavies
Have no
Scripture
Against
the Churches
Infal-
libility.

The Que-
stion ought
not to be
removed
from the
Plea of
Possession.

An Instan-
ce.

Disc. III. CXI. *Against our Pleading Possession.* 355

Possession, unless An *Evident Law* Come Against it, which we expect from you, but Fear it not. Sir, you Possess a Benefice, And can, if need be, shew How you came by it; whether it be a Writing, or, some Thing equivalent, it Imports not; You have beside, the Possession of it. Suppose now, Any One would Endeavour to Disturbe you, or Doubt of your supposed Right, You would Plead both These Titles, Would you not? Answer This and, your Objection is solved.

17. A Fifth Objection *page 628.* Lyes I know not How, wrap up in twenty Obscurities. It is much to This sense. We must prove, that there is no other way to Interpret the Law of Christ, but by our Church. With all, That the Church cannot come into a Possession of Any Thing, but what was Originally Given Her by the Legislator. Mark upon what Duties we are Put. We *must prove*, And by the Law (For Here is the last Trial with These men) that our Church Interpret's faithfully, whilst They sit Down speechles, as it were, in their own Cause, And must not prove, That their Church Interpret's better. Moreover; Note also by the way, How the whole Question is now removed from the Law, and comes to This Issue, whether Our Interpretation or Theirs, be more Conformable to Gods Word. Most certainly, Their Interpretation is worth little, becaus confessedly fallible, And Therefore, Proceed's not from the Infalible Assistance of the Holy Ghost, As is Amply Declared Disc. 2. c. 9. n. 7. 8. 9. where we propose the Difficulty, And Prove; That One Only Oracle, Christs own Spouse, which is Assisted by the Holy Ghost, Interpret's

*Sommarie
put us on
Duties
which
they cannot
Comply
with.*

The Question is removed from the Law to Interpretations.

The proof lies on our Adversaries.

pret's Scripture Infallibly. Now, if our Adversary Except's Against our Scriptures And Reasons there Alleged, The Task of Proving will ly on Him; For He must either Prove, That our Proofs are *Proofoes*, or That His, Far surpasss them in worth, And a clearer Evidence, And He will find an Insuperable Difficulty in Both. All I say now, is. Though the Interpretation of our Church were Fallible, it is as good as yours; And if we respect its Age, which gives some Preheminence, it may be Accounted much better. We have largely Answered to the other part of the Objection, in the whole first Discours, And Proved, that *the Church cannot Come into the Possession of Any Doctrin, but what is Allowed of by the Legislator.* It's otherwise, I am sure, with your Church, which, becaus Fallible, may Alter, when, and as often As Sectaries Pleas. To end, Our Adversary Should have known that the Matter now Debated, Depend's not *Immediately* on the Churches Infallibility; for Here is our Immediate Plea. The Church was Once true, And ever since its first Foundation, Pleaded Constantly this quiet Possession of Truth. Ergo unless that first ground be shaken, And this Pleading Possession be Evidently Disproved, it ought to be supposed true still: And thus You se how the obligation of Proving, lyes irremovably on our Adversaries.

*A fallible
Church
may belably
Err.*

19. There yet Remain some other wordy Objections, but I wave them, becaus They are solved, And in real Truth, are meer *Suppositions*, and no *Proofs*. Sometimes, They will Have *Tradition to be Proved, which is its Own manifest Proof.* Sometimes They tell us, that a *bare Possession* in matters of Religion is a senseless

Disc. III. C. XI. *Against our Pleading Possession.* 357
senseless Plea (They suppose we have no more.) Sometimes, that we are plainly the *Imposers*, And They Not Aggressors, And both are supposed. I pass these, and now hasten to one Objection more, solved in a Third Proposition.

C H A P. XII.

An other Objection. And whether Protestants can Acquit themselves of Schism.

1. **S**OME may Argue further, And say, we have ^{*A simple Objection.*} Shitherto Supposed a Wrong Principle, *Viz.* That our Errours are to be shewed us *Evidently*, which is not so. For, it is Enough to make them known by strong Moral Proofs, These sufficiently Convince us as Guilty, And Clear Them of the crime of Schism. Neither can we have stronger Arguments Then moral in this Matter, Becaus Principles of Faith are not Evident in Themselves; All Discours Therefore built on Them, must Fall short of Metaphysical Evidence. Observe in Passing. If our Protestants (As They think) Bring strong moral Arguments Against our Supposed Errours, We give Them *As Good as They Bring*, And clear our Cause by as strong good moral Solutions to those Arguments (They say the one, and we the other) Who must be Believed? Or, Who must Judge here? And, if Again, They hold

Y y 3

358 Disc. III. C. XII. *Protestants cannot Acquit*
 hold themselves, by Force of such moral Proofs, Ac-
 quit of Schism (which all Sectaries Pretend to) we
 Charge it again on them, *By far more valid Arguments*.
 Who Judges now? Who is to be Believed? Neither
 of us yet, For Hitherto we only Talk without Princi-
 ples. Yet the Catholick hath his Principle in Rea-

*The Catho-
 lick An-
 swer founde
 ed on a
 certain
 Principle.*

*We would
 Gladly
 Hear of
 Protestants
 Proofs a-
 gainst us,
 reduced to
 sound Prin-
 ciples.*

*Principles
 of Faith
 once ad-
 mitted of
 may ground
 a certain
 Conclusion.*

dines : A LONG ANCIENT POSSESSION now insisted on
 (which is eleven Points of the Law.) But *By what good*
Law do our Protestants take this Right from him, or Turn him
out of Possession? By what strong moral Proof, ground-
 ed on an undubitable moral Principle, can They con-
 vince us of Errours, and clear Themselves of Schism?
 I'll Tell you (and 'tis a Truth) They have neither
 Proof nor Principle to rely on, *But their own Proffes*
word. If I wrong them, They can Right Themsel-
 selves, and convince *me by good Arguments in Form.* To
 what is Added of the Vnevidence of Faith, I Answer:
 Though the Principles Therof, For example; the *Words*
of Scripture, or the Definitions of Councils want Me-
 taphysical Evidence in themselves (Because only reveal-
 ed Truths) Yet They are certain, And, once Admitted
 of as Certain, can Ground a Discours, which (if well
 Deduced) need's no more to Faulter, or Deviate from
 good Form, then if we Argued *out of Euclid's Principles.*
 Thus much *per transennam.* Now to answer the Argu-
 men Home, Here is

2. My Third Proposition. Protestants *cannot so*
much as Probably Acquit Themselves of Schism, nor Probably
impeach the Roman Catholick Church of Errour Causal of Their
Schism. I prove the first part of my Assertion. No
 Probability can Acquit them of Schism, when Eviden-
 ce layes That crime on them, But this is True; And

to

to prove the Assumption, I will not Here Tell Them, How Improbable it is, That This Schism, which took its Rise from one Discontented *Luther*, and a *Disgusted Prince*, can have any Good in it; The cause from whence it came look's like naught, And the Doleful Effect which Followed, wors. Nor, will I urge Again How Improbable it is, That this *one Prince*, and one *Fryar* (of lives confessedly Vicious) can be Supposed to have gon About any Work of God or Piety, when meer Passion *Hurried them on to struggle Against Their own Consciences, Against a whole Church, And the Faith of their Deceased Ancestours.* These Considerations I'll wave.

13. Yet I cannot But Note how improbable it is, To Suppose, That All those learned Councils which Anciently Taught Christianity; All those Learned Bishops, Those Doctors, Those Religious, who like Stars Beautified the Terrestrial Heaven of the Roman Catholick Church for a Thousand years Together, Had, notwithstanding Their Vigilancy, such a Mist cast before Their Eyes, as not to Discover Those Palpable Gross Errors which our Protestants have now so lately Espied. Say Therefore (the Question is worth Answering) How came it to pass, That our Protestants first saw these Errors, And upon that *Monstrous Sight* Quitted *Rome*, whilst Others As Sharp-sighted, as Numerous, And learned as They, Saw none of them for many Ages Before? Speak probably. Why, for example, Did not so Eminent a Saint and Doctor, as *St. Gregory the Great* was, or his Clergy, so many following *Innocents*, so many *Chinensis*, so many *Urban*s see these Errors, and upon the Discovery, Separate themselves long since from this supposed Erring Church? I would hear their Answer.

*Evidence
lays the
Crime of
Schism on
Protestants.*

*It is im-
probable to
say that
Sectaries
Discovered
Errors in
the Church
unseen by
Thousands
more learn-
ed and nu-
merous
than They.*

360 Disc. III. CXII. *Protestants cannot Acquit*
 swer. If they except Against These, Because They we-
 re Popes, I Ask, Why at least Did not so many *Be-*
rnards, so many *Malachies*, so many *Benness*, so many *An-*
selms, so many *Kings*, so many *Princes* (whose Tempo-
 ral interest, God knows, lay not in Adoring Rome)
 with innumerable Others long Agoe Desert This Sup-
 posed Erring Church, and Revolt from it as *Luther* did?
 Is it not a Degree of Madnes to Suppose, That All
 These Worthy, Powerful, and Learned Professors of
 the Catholick Faith, were either so Stupidly Blind, as not
 to have seen Such *Errors*, or so Wickedly Hypocritical as, to
 Have Winked at them, After a clear Discovery? I say mo-
 re. The Professors of this Church were so far of
 from not Seeing those Doctrins which Protestants now
 call Errours: For example, *The offering up of Sacrifice*
For the Dead, *Praying to Saints &c.* That the Denial
 of them was Positively condemned as Heretical, in
 Foregoing Sectaries. None shall ever Probably An-
 swer this Question no more, then give Satisfaction to
 an Other, *Viz.*

These
Learned
and innume-
erable
Professors
must either
be supposed
stupidly
blind or
wickedly
hypocriti-
cal.

4. When this Schism was first made by a few Dis-
 gustted men in England, Why did so many, not only
 in that Iland, Though temporally Vndon for their
 pains, But innumerable more in the Christian World
 abroad Stand up Against it, and Oppose it on its first
 Appearance, as a most Pernicious Novelty? All these
 condemned it as Heretical, and Held the Broachers
 of it for Hereticks. Now, had either Goodnes, Rea-
 son, or Religion accompanied this Schism, it should
 have rather Gained an Vniversal Applaus from Others,
 more numerous and learned then those were, who Be-
 gan it. But all was contrary, it Appeared like an-
 other

The Oppo-
sition made
so Vniver-
sally against
this Schism
proves it
monstrous.

other *Ismael*. *Manus eius contra omnes, & manus omnium contra eum*, as Opposite to All, so Univerſally Opposed by All; And how could these few Abbetters of it, When this foul Work first Began, without intolérable Pride, *The intolérable Pride of Sottaries* Think *Themselves Wiſer in Patronizing it*, Then the Rest of the Christian World in Condemning it?

5. Here then is my first Argument Against this Schism. A new Sect, Schism, or Heresy (call it what you will) which was never Heard of before in the World. And on its first Appearance, met with an Universal Opposition made by All other Christians, who then Lived, Cannot be from God, or Sound and Approved Doctrin. But thus the Schism of Protestants was, at its first Rise, Univerſally Opposed, And is so yet: Ergo, it cannot be from God, or sound Doctrin. The Major is Evident in the cases of Arius, Pelagius, and other Hereticks: For the universal Dislike and Opposition Raised Against These Schisms and Heresies were, even Antecedently to Their Condemnation in Councils, Proof enough against them. And if our Adversaries Require more; - to wit a Council condemnation, We have it Also. They cannot in Justice make Any more Exception Against the Council of Trent, Then Arius made against the Nicene Council. The Minor is as clear; for all Christians, who then were in being, Condemned the English Heresy and Schism. Græcians Disliked it, and do so to this Day: arians, Abyssins, Nestorians &c. And; most of all Catholics Oppose it so far, That not one will Believe as Protestants Do. So True it is: *Manus unum contra eam*, All Banded against this Novelty; Therefore it cannot be from God or approved Doctrin. Now, That our Protestants since their first Rise, have Gained

362 Disc. III. CXIII. *Seſtaries Cavils of*
 ed the company of ſome few larring and Diſſenting
 Brethren, Proves Nothing; For *Arius* in time Got
 more, and I believe, had them better united in Do-
 ſtrin, Then Theſe ever will be.

C H A P. XIII.

A Second Argument Againſt this Schiſm. Of Seſtaries Cavils Con- cerning Errours, Entring the Church Inſenſibly.

*An Argu-
 ment ad
 Hominem
 againſt Se-
 ſtaries.*

*Proteſtants
 highly Diſ-
 grace that
 large Ca-
 thoſick
 Church
 which
 They own,*

1. I Argue 2. Proteſtants, ſeemingly at leaſt, Own
 a *Holy Vniuerſal Catholick Church* before *Luther* of a
 very large Extent, which comprized a Generality of
 Chriſtians *Over and Above the number of Roman Catholicks*.
 This Church was ſurely that *Hieruſalem* (mentioned by
 the Prophet) upon whoſe *wales Watchmen* were placed,
 And were by Duty to Speak in Gods Cauſe, when
 his Honor was Concerned. In this Church we ſhall
 Certainly find Thoſe *Vigilant Paſtors, Docters, and*
Teachers, Ephes. 4. Who Perfect *Saints*, and ſtill *Edify*
 the *Mystical Body of Chriſt*, to the end, That we be
 not carried Away by *every Wind of Doctrin* &c. Now
 I Aſſume. But, with our Proteſtants leave, All
 the Watchmen, all the Paſtors, all the Teachers of
 this Ample and far Extended Church, were ſo Careleſ-
 ly aſleep, ſo Negligent and Forgetful of their Duty,
 For

Disc III.C.XIII. *Errours entering the Church.* 363

For the vast interval of a Thousand years Together ,
That they took no notice of These (now Imagined)
Roman Errours by any *Publick Censure*, or *Condemnation*;
But contrarywise Permitted Rome to Revel, to Coun-
tenance Errour , Yea, and to be quite carried Away
with the Slight Doctrin (as They suppose) of an *Vn-
bloody Sacrifice of the Real Presence, of Purgatory &c.* On-
ly, Forsooth, one *Martin Luther*, and our Protestants,
had such quick eyes as to Se Them, and upon the
sight to Hold themselves Obliged in conscience , to
make an eternal Divorce from this Church , wherein
they were Baptized . Observe here not only Para-
dox upon Paradox , But also a whole Heap of *Impossi-
bilities pack't together.*

*Our New men saw These too plain
and visible Errours ; But this large Vigilant Church saw Them
not.*

*They were so Sensible of the Honour of Christian Faith
as to Condemn Them ; But this great Church was so Senseless as
to Dissemble All. They now Separate, Spurn, and Kick at this
Church As Antichristian, But That Ample Catholick Society
did never so much as put a Mark of Dishonour on Rome, For
want of true Doctrin. If ever such a Mark, Note,
Censure, Private or Publick Act, Issued out from an
Vniversal Church Against the Church of Rome, Let
them speak, And I'll be silent Hereafter : If not, it is A
Strange Boldnes To make Themselves more Wise,
Zealous, and Vigilant, then that Vniversal Church
was (which Here to their Prejudice They own) Be-
caus, forsooth, Rome must loos the Title of the church
Vniversal.*

*Protestants
make
Themselves
more wise,
vigilant,
and zealous
then then
their large
Catholick
Church.*

2. Our Protestants therfore must grant (there is no
Denying it) That, Either This Vniversal Church had
lost Her Eyes , or was more then Impiously. Negli-

gent over the Charge committed to Her, which was
 to Teach, to Instruct, to Reprehend, and Crush Heresies as
 They Appeared; Or (which is the Real Truth) That
 They find Fault with Errours which never were. Now
 Here Observe, an Other great Advantage given against
 Themselves, And How They Honor Rome, and
 Disgrace Their own imagined and more Universal Church.
 The Church of Rome was Vigilant, And (as the World
 knows) Ever Ready, Age after Age, to Suppress He-
 resies as they Rose up, and Declare Against Them (Wi-
 nes the Condemned Arians, Nestorians, Monothelists &c.)
 But this imagined Universal Church was so Sleepy and Incon-
 cerned, as to Permit one Particular Church (For Rome, They
 say, was no more) to Own, and Strongly to Foment
 Those very Errours (And this without so much as a word
 of Reproof) which Caused our Conscienceable, and tender
 Hearted Protestants to Schismatize as they did, and Bid Adieu
 to Rome For ever. A strange Tendernes of Conscience
 Indeed, which (to take of the Guilt of Schism from
 Themselves) doth not only cast an Eternal Ignominy
 upon this Vast Imagined Church, But makes it also
 Sinful and Damnable, For Dissembling so long with Errours,
 which caused at last our Protestants Schism.

*The Dili-
 gence of the
 Roman
 Church
 compared
 with the
 Negligence
 of Their
 great Im-
 agined Ca-
 tholick
 Church.*

*The tender
 Conscience
 of Prote-
 stants.*

3. What can they reply to this Argument? Will
 they say, This Great Society of Christians had not
 power to contrast with the Roman Church? The
 whole is greater then a Part, and Rome, They say (If
 Yet so much) Was only Part of that Universal Socie-
 ty. However, If Power was wanting, where was
 the zeal of this Church? Can one Luther, and His few
 Associates Be Supposed to have had more zeal, Then flamed in
 the Hearts of so many Pastors and Doctors For ten Ages To-
 gethere

*A vast im-
 probability,
 That one
 Luther
 can be sup-
 posed to ha-*

gether? They may Reply. The Church of Rome was ever Held sound in Fundamentals, Though not every way Right in Faith, Therefore this great Church Thought it better patiently to wink at these lesser Faults, then to raise a Tempest in the Christian World, not easily calmed. Observe first: How These men, when They have said much, and Proved nothing, know every Thing without new Revelations. First, They know where this vast Church was, Though no body ever yet Heard of it. 2. What it Thought. 3. Vpon what Motives it Dissembled so long &c. But let all this Pass. My Answer is. *Ex ore tuo te judico.* Did this Church Prudently wink at these less *Supposed Errours*, Becaus not *Fundamental*, nor *Destructive* of Salvation? Why did not our good Protestants do so also? Did it Hold it safer to sit down Quietly, Then to raise a Tempest amongst Christians? Why did not our Protestants take to the same Cours also? *In Doing so, They had made Themselves as well Inheritors of their Fore-fathers Peace and Wisdom, as They now are of their Lands.* But to Disown the better Inheritance, to Condemn their Ancestours, and a whole Church beside of Errour, To make a violent Bustle, a hideous Tumult in the Christian World, upon Little Causes, is in a word open Injustice, And flat Rebellion. I say upon *Little Causes*: For in Kingdoms and Commonwealths, where the Laws are without Exception good, it is hard to find the Practical Government so free from all Misdemeanours, But that you will have Eyes enough to *Espy Them*, and Harts ready, upon very Little Feeling, to Clamour against Them: Yet Licencence once these Malcontents so Rebel when they feel a little

we had more knowledge and Zeal then this whole Church.
A Reply.

Protestants ought to have proceeded as Their Imagined Church Did,

Their open Injustice and plain Rebellion is undeniable.

*Licence
Malcon-
tents to re-
bel upon
little Ag-
grievances,
and all Go-
vernment
is destroyed*

little *Smart*, and Adieu, say I, to all *Loyalty*: Civil Government is Destroyed, both *Regal*, and *Other*. Admit therefore, That, there Had been Abuses in the Church of Rome, as also (which is *Fals*) it had Failed in *Non-fundamentals* of Faith, Yet Evident Reason shewes the Schism made by Protestants to be Vnexcusable. For, as that man Commit's an Vnexcusable Crime, who for little Agrievances in a Kingdom wherein He is born, Openly Rebels against it, So He Commits a higher Offence, if for petty Faults, He Rebells against an Ancient Church, wherein he was Baptized. Now it was as Clear to the First Schismatizing Protestants, That the Church of Rome was the Mother Church that gave them Baptism, as it is clear to any Subject in the World, That such a Kingdom first gave him Life. Vnpardonable Therefore is the Crime of Schism in Every one, which can never Suppose a just Cause. And thus much not only the Holy Fathers do, but our Protestants also, Must Confess: For, to

*Schism:
cannot sup-
pose a just
Cause.*

*A Paradox.
The Church
of Rome
want's No-
thing Ne-
cessary to
Salvation,
yet it is
Necessary
to Salva-
tion to lea-
ve it.*

Tell me on the one side, That the Church of Rome hath All Things Necessary to Salvation, And yet on the Other, to Assert, It is Necessary to Salvation to leave it (when it want's nothing Necessary) is Implicatory in Terms, Yea, and Gives Liberty to Protestants to Leave their own Church when they list; where there is Danger enough of more then little Errours, which Prejudice Salvation.

4. And here is Proof enough of the other Part of my Assertion, which was: Protestants cannot probably Impeach the Roman Catholick Church of Errours; Causall of their Schism. You have already the Reason. For if Faults, less or more Usually seen, even in well ordered Commonwealths, can not give just Cause of publick Rebellion,

Disc. II I. C. XIII. *Errors entering the Church.* 387

bellion, much less could These Supposed Faults And unproved ^{Sectaries} Errors, not Fundamental in the Church of Rome, give just ^{must either} Cause to our Protestants of Their shameful Schism against it. ^{convince} Therefore They ought to convince us of Errors highly ^{us of Er-} Fundamental, And so make us no True Christian ^{rors high-} Church, or, They must sit Down Branded with the ^{ly Funda-} black Note of both causal and Formal Schismaticks. There ^{mental, or} is no avoiding it. ^{They are} plain Schis-
^{matics.}

5. Again I Argue. If Errors Causal of Protestants Schism Invaded the Church of Rome, They entered After the first 4. or 5. Hundred years; For so long (say They) That Church was Orthodox: But it is more then Improbable, That such a Deluge of them, as our Adversaries Charge on us, Invaded that Church, and Diffused Themselves all Over. I prove the ^{The high} minor. ^{improbabi-} They could not Enter this Church without Publick De-
^{lity of Er-} fense, and Publick Resistance. ^{gours, En-} Defense in Those who first ^{bring the} Heretically Vended Them: ^{Church,} Resistance in others, who Catho-
^{laid forth.} lickly Opposed Them. But there was never since Christs Time, Any such first Publick Heretical Defense, nor first Publick Catholick Opposition of These Supposed Errors. The Real Presence; The Sacrifice of the Mass, Prayers for the Dead, Prayer to Saints &c. Only Hereticks Condemned for their Pains Opposed them, But no others. Let us therefore Appeal to Reason, and Ask. How it was Possible, That such lowd Clamorous Novelties ^{A clear} could ^{Conviction} so silently, And as it were by night, creep into a Church, and ^{of Secta-} no Body Discover Them on their first Appearance? ^{ries.} How was it Possible, That they could become Publick Owned Objects of mens Faith, and Gain an Vniversal Belief through a whole Ample Church, And no Body yet know when this new Belief (or, Unheard of Professed Faith) first began? No-
thing

*Drawn
from the
Moral Im-
possibility
of the En-
trance of
such sup-
posed Er-
rors.*

*An Instan-
ce confirm's
all that is
said.*

*The Appli-
cation of
the Instan-
ce.*

thing can be more *Improbable*, *Paradoxal*, and moral-ly more *Impossible*. And

6. To shew you further the *Impossibility* of this *Clandestine Entrance* of publick *Errours* into a Church, without Publick Notice or Clamours against Them, Be pleased to Reflect here upon one Instance. Suppose, That a new sort of men should now begin to Broach an Impious Doctrin, And openly Teach that the water in Baptism, which washeth away sin, is as Really the True Blood of Christ, And Therefore worthy of Adoration, as Catholicks Hold a consecrated Host to be his *sacred Body*, and upon that Account *Adorable*. Would not such a *Novelty* (Think ye) where it Publickly Begins, be Publickly also Clamor'd against by *Sound and Orthodox Christians*? Yes. And if it Gradually got ground; or more Followers in Time (not easily Suppressed) Would it not, as well As all other Heresies, which have troubled the World, Remain upon Clear and Undoubted Record for Posterity to read? Certainly yes. Yet more: Can this Persuasion live in any rational Man, That such a *Novelty* might in time be so Held an Article of Faith by a Most Ample and Learned church; That The Professors Therof would Dy for it? The Seven Wonders of the world are not comparable to this one. Observe the Application. There was a time (say Protestants) to wit For the 4. or 5. first Ages after Christ, When the whole pure Primitive Church, no more Believed Christ *sacred Body* to be Really and Substantially under the Species of Bread, Then now we Believe His *sacred Blood* to be under the Species of water in Baptism. There was a Time when the One as little Deserved Worship, or Adoration as the Other. For, both were only Holy Signs, and no More.

T here

There was a Time when this whole Church grew Mad, and Brought in the most Palpable and Erroneous Novelty that ever the World Heard of, or Record Preserved, What? A piece of bread before not Christs Body, was then (O Strange Time!) Believed to be his Body; A whole Ample Learned Church was then Cheated into that Belief; And whereas, it once Deserved no Worship (say our Protestants) All at last fell down and Adored it in the Open View of the World; And to Testify that They did so in Earnest, Innumerable have shed their blood in Defense of what they Believed.

*Evidences
Against
Sectaries.*

Yet (and here is the Wonder of Wonders) no man can say: Who those were that first introduced this supposed Monster of Novelties. No man can say in what Age, under what Pope This Error First got Growth, and Patrons for it.

No man can Tell me, what Orthodox Christians first stood up in Gods cause, and Opposed it. No man can Tell me, when this Visible and Publick Adoration of an Host Began.

No man can Tell me, How, or when this new supposed coyned Doctrin (Serpent like) first crept into mens hearts, And at last Poysoned A whole Universal Church.

Hideous were these Novelties, Prodigious these Visible supposed Changes, Yet Hush! All passed in silence, no Body saw them, No body mention's them, Not one Author (neither Friend nor Enemy) Writ them, or left them upon Record.

*No Author
ever men-
tioned the-
se No-
tions, visi-
ble, suppo-
sed Chan-
ges.*

Is not this, Think ye, (whilst all other Heresies are most exactly Registered) more then a Pythagorean and Prodigious Silence?

*Sectaries
trifle
whilst*

7. It is Pittiful to see with what petty Trifles, our Adversaries Oppugn the Strength of this most Convincing Argument. Some tell us of a Beard growing gray Imperceptibly, of the Index of a Clock moving Insensibly, of

*They oppose
the
Strength of
our Argu-
ments.*

Aaa

Tates mens.

*Drawn
from the
Moral Im-
possibility
of the En-
trance of
such sup-
posed Er-
rors.*

thing can be more *Improbable*, *Paradoxal*, and moral-ly more *Impossible*. And

*An Instan-
ce confirm's
all that is
said.*

6. To shew you further the *Impossibility* of this *Clandestine Entrance* of publick *Errours* into a Church, without Publick Notice or Clamours against Them, Be pleased to Reflect here upon one Instance. Suppose, That a new sort of men should now begin to Broach an *Impious Doctrin*, And openly Teach that the water in Baptism, which washeth away sin, is *as Really the True Blood of Christ*, And Therefore worth of Adoration, as Catholics Hold a consecrated Host to be his *sacred Body*, and upon that Account *Adorable*. Would not such a *Novelty* (Think ye) where it Publickly Begins, be Publickly also Clamor'd against by *Sound and Orthodox Christians*? Yes. And if it Gradually got ground; or more Followers in Time (not easily Suppressed) Would it not, as well As all other Heresies, which have troubled the World, Remain upon Clear and Undoubted Record for Posterity to read? Certainly yes. Yet more: Can this *Persuasion* live in any rational Man, That such a *Novelty* might in time be so Held an *Article of Faith* by a *Most Ample and Learned Church*; That The Professors Therof would Dy for it? The *Seven Wonders of the World* are not comparable to this one.

*The Appli-
cation of
the Instan-
ce.*

Observe the Application. There was a time (say Protestants) to wit For the 4. or 5. first Ages after Christ, When the whole pure Primitive Church, no more Believed Christ *sacred Body* to be Really and substantially under the Species of Bread, Then now we Believe His *sacred Blood* to be under the Species of water in Baptism. There was a Time when the One as little Deserved Worship, or Adoration as the Other. For, both were only Holy Signs, and no More.

T here

There was a Time when this whole Church grew Mad, and Brought in the most Palpable and Erroneous Novelty that ever the World Heard of, or Record Preserved, What? A piece of bread before not Christs Body, was then (O Strange Time!) Believed to be his Body; A whole Ample Learned Church was then Cheated into that Belief; And wheras, it once Deserved no Worship (say our Protestants) All at last fell down and Adored it in the Open View of the World; And to Testify that They did so in Earnest, Innumerable have shed their blood in Defense of what they Believed.

Yet (and here is the Wonder of Wonders) no man can say: Who those were that first introduced this supposed Monster of Novelties. No

man can say in what Age, under what Pope This Error First got Growth, and Patrons for it. No man can Tell

me, what Orthodox Christians first stood up in Gods cause, and Opposed it. No man can Tell me,

when this Visible and Publick Adoration of an Host Began. No man can Tell me, How, or when this

new supposed Coyned Doctrin (Serpent like) first crept's into mens harts, And at last Poysoned A whole Universal Church.

Hideous were these Novelties, Prodigious these Visible supposed Changes, Yet Hush! All passed in silence, no Body saw them, No body mention's them, Not one

Author (neither Friend nor Enemy) Writ them, or left them upon Record. Is not this, Think ye, (whilst all

other Heresies are most exactly Registred) more then a Pythagorean and Prodigious Silence?

7. It is Pittiful to see with what petty Trifles, our Adversaries Oppugn the Strength of this most Convin-

cing Argument. Some tell us of a Beard growing gray Imperceptibly, of the Index of a Clock moving Insensibly, of

Aaa

*Evidences
Against
Sectaries.*

*No Author
ever men-
tioned the-
se Note-
rious, visi-
ble, suppo-
sed Chan-
ges.*

*Sectaries
trifle
whilst
They oppose
the
Strength of
our Argu-
ment.*

Tares peeping up in a Field when men are aſleep. And who can Queſtion (ſaith one very Profoundly) *the birth of an Infant, Becauſe He knows not the time of its Conception?* Errors Therefore might grow up with like ſilence in a Church, and as Inſenſibly. Obſerve this Triſling. We ſpeak in the Inſtance now given of a viſible Mountain, and our Adverſaries Send us to ſeek for Inviſible Moaſts in an old Waſted Garment. Say, I Beſeech you: Can they ſuppoſe That all Objects are alike Diſcernable by our Senſes? Or, is it as eaſy to find a needle in a Bundle of ſtraw, As to ſe Towers and Caſtles before our eyes in a fair Sun ſhin day? The Suppoſed Novelty now mentioned, the *Suppoſed change* of a whole Church into another Belief, the Imagined New Publick Adoration of A Sacrament, were more Diſcernable and Viſible then Mountains and Caſtles, And cannot be Parallel'd with the Im-perceptible Graynes of a beard, with Tares peeping up &c. However This we can ſay. Certainly ſo many years ſince, the beard was not gray, now it is, So many Months ſince, Tares were not, now they are. Let our Adverſaries Proceed with like Evidence againſt us, and ſay Certainly (not doubtfully) ſuch Suppoſed Errors Then were not in the Church, but afterward Began, and within the precise Compaſs of ſo many years. But This They cannot probably Hint at. The laſt Inſtance of a childs Conception is the worſt of All; For if you know its Birth, you know the conception was nine Months before, according to the ordinary cours of nature; Though if both were hid from us, it is a Forceles inſtance, Vnles we ſuppoſe that all Trivial Matters muſt as well be known, and ſtand upon Record, as Things of greateſt Concernment. The late woful
Burning

*Seſtaries
Parallel
Things of
their own
nature not
perceptible,
with O-
thers moſt
Viſible and
Maſtifeſt.*

Disc. III. C. XIII. *Errours entering the Church.* 371

Burning of London, will (I'll warrant it) be Exactly Recorded, when the birth of twenty Infants is never thought on, and so should the General Ruin of Faith in a whole Church, have stood Registered.

8. One word more. Though These Examples were to the Purpose (as indeed They are not) at most they would only shew, and Pittifully enough, How such supposed changes might perhaps be made: But are far from Proving, *They were made so De facto*: For this carries no likely-hood of an Argument with it. I'll shew you how These Errours might Enter the Church insensibly, How these Changes might get in with Silence. Ergo it was so, Thus they were made, *De facto*. *A Potentiâ ad actum non valet Consequentia.*

Could Se-
baries
shew how
such chan-
ges might
enter the
Church
that proves
not they
entered.

No man can Argue from a meer Possibility of their *Clancular Entrance*, that in real Truth They entered in Such a manner. Sectaries may say, They Suppose these changes made upon other Principles, And now only shew by Instances, How They might get in without Noise, and publick Notice. Here, we may have plain Dealing, if it please our Adversaries. Shew you Therefore, My Good Friends, by any Thing like a *Solid Proof* or Principle, That the change we now speak of was *Actually* made in the Church: Say plainly, *This supposed Novelty was not in such an Age, but afterward*, And let a solid Proof make good both Assertions; And then Your Instances of *Tares* and *Beards growing gray* will be to no purpose, Because the Changes which you say were made, are now upon your *Supposition* strongly proved *Aliunde*, That is, By other *solid Grounds*, and this without the help of these weak instances. Here therefore is an *Vnanswerable Dilemma* for you. *You either endeavour to show that the*

An Inse-
rence from
a meer Possi-
bility to
The Act is
Null.

Their
examples
neither
Prove these
pretended
novelties
introduced,
nor suppose
them pro-
ved by any
known
Supposed Principle.

Supposed Novelty of the Real Presence entered the Church, Because your Examples of Tares, and a clock index convinceth the Actual Entrance of it, And This Inference, as I said now, is Non-sense, Thus it might Enter, Ergo thus it did Enter.

Or, Contrarywise, You can clearly Prove that the Church began such a Novelty by undeniable Grounds, without depending of these Instances.

Protestants make their own Instances impertinent and forceles.

If you do this solidly, your instances are worth nothing. For, if you convince by an undeniable Principle, that the Church brought in this new Doctrine in any Age, you need not at all to talk of a gray beard, or, of Tares peeping up insensibly, Because you must now suppose the pretended innovation clearly Proved, by other, far better and undeniable Grounds.

An Instance against Them.

Do this, and you make your own Instances, *Eo ipso*, Null, and as impertinent, as Forceles. For, Most surely, No man in his wits will go about to prove that Protestantism, for Example, came into the world insensibly as a beard grows Gray, when he can evidently Demonstrate by other undeniable Principles the Palpable Beginning of it. And thus it is in the present Controversy.

Their pretense to make Novelties in the Church so be highly probable, is more than improbable.

9. One may yet say. They cannot, 'T is true, Demonstratively Evidence the supposed change now in Controversy; yet are able, upon strong Moral Proofs, to make it highly Probable.

Contra 1. If you make it highly Probable, Talk no more of Tares and Beards; For one Proof of this nature will be of more Advantage to your cause, then the secret peeping up of a Thousand weeds in a garden. *Contra* 2. If this your Assertion be made probable, it must stand upon a strong Moral certain Principle, *whereof none can but most imprudently Doubt.*

Deal Candidly, Give us in plain lan-

Disc. III. C. XIII. *Errours entering the Church.* 373

language this High Moral *certain Principle*, wheron your Assertion hath Footing, and you'll Gain much. But if after the Offer, you Turn us of with words, or lead us by a loos Discours to what you *may say is Morally Certain*, Though thousands more learned vow the Contrary, you'll only First Discredit your self, and next your Cause much more. Speak plainly on Gods Name, Here is place for it. Make your *undoubted Principle* known, wherby your Assertion is *proved*, And you will do more then Ever Protestant did yet, or, shall do Hereafter.

Contra 3. It is a meer whimsy, to suppose Proofs highly probable against This ever *Taught and unchangeable Doctrin of the Catholick Church*, which stand's Firm, First, upon *Christs own Express words*, *This is my Body*.

2. On the Irrefragable Authority of so many most Ancient Fathers, that speak not only *Dubiously* of the Mytery, But as clearly *Defend* it, as the Council of *Trent Defines* it, wherof more largely Hereafter. To These Principles, We Add the *Testimony and Express Belief* of our whole Learned, both past and present *Roman Catholick Church*, Too strong a Proof, to be Battered or shaken by Empty words.

Wherefore Every one may Consider what a *hard Task* Sectaries have in hand, if They go about to *make Their Contrary Assertion highly Probable*.

First, They are Obliged to *Prove*, and by a *sure Principle*, That *Christ spoke im-*

properly, or, according to Their sense. 2. That all, or at least most of the Fathers Erred in their Doctrin of the Blessed Sacrament.

3. That They quite Overthrow the *Roman Catholick Doctrin by the Authority of some other Church*, that was ever Held by *Christians more Orthodox, and Apostolical* then our *Roman Church* is.

All this is

No proof
can be pro-
bable that
stands an-
gainst un-
deniable
Principles,

It will be
hard to find
an Ortho-
dox Chri-
stian Socie-
ty of greater
Authority
then the
Roman
Catholick
Church;

to be don not by Talk, But by Sober, Solid, and Vndeniable moral Principles, which, both Friends and Enemies ought, if They be Rational, to acknowledge as Principles *Morally certain*. When Sectaries shall pleas to do what is here plainly required (And it must be performed if they speak pertinently) Then I shall begin to think, That, *They meer Fallible men may speak more boldly and Say. . . Our Church is Fallible, and hath brought in, both this new mentioned, and many other Innovations.*

*The Con-
sciences of
Sectaries
are pressed
to proue
what They
teach of
Errors in
the Church,*

*Not by
Empty
words, but
certain
Principles,*

Therefore, I deeply Charge their Consciences, as They will Answer it at the day of Iudgement, not to Trifle in a most serious matter; But, without Ambiguity, plainly to touch the *Difficulty*, And to make known to the whole World, what that owned Principle is, wheron this Their Proposition stand's: *The whole Church is Fallible, and hath introduced This Novelty of Christs Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament.* I speak boldly. And dare say: *It is a Flat Heresy, And, therefore Sectaries have nothing like a Principle Morally certain,* wherby the strength of the contrary *Verity*, mantained by *Scripture, Church, and Fathers*, can be meanly Quarrelled with, much les solidly Reproved; unles the too simple talk of a Few Novellists be able to *Evers, and Overturn* what God hath Revealed, And a whole ample Church Defends upon Revelation.

10. Perhaps it will be said first. The Fathers that Defend the Real presence were fallible and might Err. I answer. Our Protestants who Deny it, are Fallible also, and may Err more. By what undoubted Principle Therefore, *can They Convince, that Their fallible rejecting the Fathers Hath weights enough, so make Null the Testimony of so many Blessed Saints, against Their Doctrin?*

What Sectaries may plead, but 'Tis more then highly improbable.

Doctrin ? We call here for *Principles*, and are not content with Empty words. They may Reply
2. They can Explicate both Scripture and Fathers contrary to the Churches Sense, And so ridd themselves of that Burden. I answer, This Riddance is none, Unles, when they have explicated, They prove by a more sure Principle, Then the Express Words of these Fathers are, *That Their Glasses hit right, and that the Fathers were Deceived*, which shall never be so much as Probably Convinced. If They lastly talk of Citing Fathers for their Heresy: I answer, They have not one, As will be amply Proved hereafter. In the mean while let them know, it will be the safest Cours to talk no more of *Changes ad Novelities* introduced into our Church without proof and Principles, to uphold *Their ill Supposed, and werr Proved Calumnies*. But enough of this Digression. We return now to other Objections.

II. Some again Tell us. *The corruptions of our Church came in, in time of greatest ignorance, when little notice was taken, and few Records were preserved of them.* Here is more Talk without Principles. For, where Read They of so great Ignorance in the Church that Disinabled all Writers to Register such vast Changes? Or, *where find they Records of those lost and Unpreserved Records?* This is only Proofless talk; if They have Records, let them be produced; if they have none, let them Hereafter Wave such blind Guesles, whilst Proofs are Expected. It would anger our Protestants, if I should tell them without Proof or unquestioned Records, that the Beard of Their Religion is Insensibly Grown gray since their new Faith came in, Or, that Tares were cast into

*Still Empty
Talk with-
out proofs
or Princi-
ples.*

*Sectaries
Guesles re-
jected.*

376 . Disc. III. C. XIII. *Sectaries Cavils of*
 into Their Church, whilst They Slept &c. Yet
 They, it seems, Are licens'd to run on with such poor
 Gueſſes, And no body muſt Check Them.

Were theſe Things unknown, it follows not that other of greater moment are unknown alſo.
 12. Next they Argue. *We cannot ſhow, When the Neceſſity of Communicating Infants, and the Rebaptizing of Hereticks, or, That Doctrin of Souls not ſeing God before the Day of Iudgement Firſt entred the Church : Yet Theſe were Errours, And their Beginning is unknown.* Here I anſwer briefly. The Communicating Infants was only Tol-
 erated for a time, But never was held a neceſſary Do-
 ctrin of the Church; Much leſs were thoſe Two other
 Points (condemned by the Church) ever Owned as
 Her Doctrin. Such Examples therfore (no Church-
 Doctrin) are to no Purpoſe, in this place.

*Theſe Ex-
 amples
 touch not
 the Diffi-
 culty,*

13. Laſtly they Tell us. *Scotus* thought *Transub-*
ſtantiation to be of no elder Date, then the Council of
Lateran, And *Bishop Fiſher* ſaith the Doctrin of *Pur-*
gatory was not much heard of in the Primitive Church.
 I would willingly ſe in *Scotus* his own works the *Diſtin.*
 and *Queſt.* Where He Aſſerts what theſe men Say:
 Some Proteſtants cite him in 4. *Diſtin.* 11. q. 3. where
 He only ſaith (in different Editions) that *Transubſtan-*
tiation was more explicitly Defined in the *Lateran Council*,
which is far from making it no older a Doctrin, Then that
Councils Definition is. But, Admit *scotus* ſaid ſo, and
Bishop Fiſher (unquoted) wors then they pretend,
The Church of Chriſt Teaches no ſuch Thing; Yet, from this
Oracle of Truth, we muſt Learn, and not from particular Do-
ctors (who may err) what Church Doctrin is. And, for
 this Reaſon I told you above, of much foul Play in
 Proteſtants, Who (Beaus they want Antiquity) take
 no little Pains to run up and down our Authors, and
 if

Disc. III. C. XIII. *Errours entering the Church.* 377

if by chance a word be found less warily spoken, They trifle with it, and presently make that Popish Doctrine: It is an Error. *Catholick Doctrine is not one Mans singular Opinion, But the Universal received Doctrine of the Church.* And thus much our Adversaries must assert for Themselves; Otherwise (when one of great Renown amongst them Tell's Protestants Plainly) It is but labour in vain to talk of union with One Another, Unless They joyn again to that moral Body, from which they once Separated, that is to those, who are in union with the Sea Apostolick; The whole English Church must here Subscribe, and say it is Protestant Doctrine. Will they Do so? The Voice therefore of One, is not the voice of All, nor one mans Opinion more mens Opinion, *Much less the sentiment of a whole Church.*

14. It is but time lost to follow these Men, whilst They Blindly run on Guessing at the Rise and Origin of our Supposed Errours, and Tell us. *All our Corruptions came not in on a sudden. They were first practised freely, and then urged as Necessary. Persons of great esteem first hold them, and Others soon followed their Example.* If one would take the Pains and trace it, He might find the Head of these Corruptions at last &c. *Pittiful slight Talk, unworthy a Scholler, And vented at random against the Primitive Church, would even Blemish that as much as any Other, yea, And Protestantism more.* I waive such stuff, because nothing like a proof follows it.

15. My last Proposition is. *Though Protestants should conceive (which is impossible) That the Roman Catholick Church hath Swerved from the Primitive Doctrine, yet, They cannot so much as Probably shew, That They have mended the Matter;*

B b b

*Catholick
Doctrine is
no Mans
singular
Opinion.*

*Blind
Guesses no
Proof of
Novelties,
brought in
to the
Church.*

*Though
Errours
were falsly
supposed to
have entered
the Church,
or yet Erro-*

stants cannot Prove that They have set Faith right again on its old Foundations.

Their pretended Reformation most discomfortable.

Sectaries have nothing like a Principle whereby their Reformation is proved Probable. It is one thing to say we have Erred, and an Other to prove, that they are Right.

What They are obliged to prove.

They can give no direct Answer to the Difficulty.

or set Christian Faith right again on its old Foundations, as it once stood sure. It is therefore a most Discomfortable Reformation, which only Tell's us of our being *Out* of the high Rode of Truth, Vnles the Reformers lead us (and this with Assurance) into the unerring way, from whence we Strayed. If This be not Don, it follows (upon the Supposition) *That both They, and We are yet piteifully Out, and Therefore both of us, must look after some third Guide to Reduce us.*

16. Now, that Protestants are utterly unable to persuade any Rational man, *that they have exactly brought Christian Faith to its Ancient Purity*, is more then Evident: For, *beside Their own bare Word* (which is worth little) They have nothing like a Principle (neither *Scripture, Councils, nor Fathers*) to Ground a probable Discours Pertinent to that Purpose; For *None of These ever Knew what a Protestant was.* It is True, They Pretend (Though God knows to little Purpose) That *Scripture, Councils, and Fathers* are against our Errours; *But it is one Thing, slightly to tell us we have Erred; and an Other solidly to Prove, that They are Right,* and have brought Christian Faith, hitherto much Tainted to its Ancient Purity. *This last is the only Difficulty.* And I Conjure Them, as They will give an Account of their Religion to Almighty God, *without Tergiversation, or Far-fetch't Discourses, Directly and Clearly to Solve it.* The Proposition to be Proved, and Positively is *Thus.* Protestants (Because they will be Reformers) are every way Right in Their Faith; from which Faith, *Catholicks have Swerved.* Observe it. *You shall never have a direct Answer so this Difficulty.* They may tell you, *Catholicks have Erred: They follow Scripture: Their Rule of Faith*

Disc. II I. C. XIII. *Errours entring the Church.* 379

Faith is what was Delivered in the first Primitive Ages, and They know that better then Papists Do. They Hope all is well with Them &c. And thus They I put you of, with Empty Words: But to Prove Solidly that Proposition is impossible. Believe it, Those Bonzies of Iapan had more Plausible Proofs to defend their Pagods, and Impugn Christianity, Then our Adversaries have to Evidence Protestantcy to be the Primitive Faith, and impugn, the Now standing Catholick Roman Religion.

C H A P. XIV.

A VVord to a Few Supposed and Vn-proved Assertions, VVherby Some Endeavour to clear Protestants of Schism.

1. **T**Heir first Proposition. *There is no Society of Mr. Sill. Christians of any one Communion, but may impose some things to be believed or practised, which may be repugnant to the general Foundations of Christian Society.* I Answer. *The Assertion is False in Protestant Principles, unless it be granted that their ample Catholick Church can destroy Christianity.* A- gain, if it Relate to the Roman Catholick Church, it is 17.

380 Disc. III. CXIV. Protestants cannot clear

is a meer unproved Fancy of their own; For This Church, as is largely shewed, Defends its Infallibility by Proofs as Certain, as the Common Grounds of Christianity are. Be it how you will; You have here our Adversaries Acknowledgement, That their particular Church of Protestancy (because Fallible) may Impose Things repugnant to the Grounds of Christianity, And this I easily Believe without further Proof.

Protestants may impose Things Contrary to the Grounds of Christianity.

2. The 2. Proposition. *There being a Possibility acknowledged, that particular Churches may require Unreasonable conditions of communion; the Obligation to communion cannot be absolute and indispensable, But only so far as nothing is required Destructive to the ends of Christian Society.* The Assertion, if I mistake not, Supposeth the Roman Catholick Church to be only a particular Church, Deficient, and liable to Errors, which is not yet so much as probably Proved, and Therefore I say, *the Obligation to Communicate which is Absolute, and Indispensable.* But let us wave this at Present, and contrary to Truth Imagine, That this Church *has imposed Unreasonable conditions, Destructive of Christian communion &c.* We Ask Again, and very seriously, who are They that can Mend the matter, in case it has Don so? Or, who dare Avouch by the Force of any received Principle, that Such and such particular Conditions imposed on Christians, are Unreasonable? Where are the Equitable and infallible Judges appointed by Almighty God to Decide in so weighty a Matter? Are they Protestants? No. It is impossible. Hear my Reason. *If the church has Erred by imposing such Unreasonable Conditions, Protestants, who Profess themselves Fallible in All They say, may Err More, Yea, And spoil all, whilst They go about to set Things Straights.* However

The Author of the proposition, sure enough, supposeth him self fit to judge what is Destructive. No Protestants can avouch so much as probably wherein the Church has imposed unreasonable Conditions. Protestants Profess them selves Fallible in all they Teach,

However, if They dare Venture on so difficult a Work, They are First obliged to Prove (And this not by Talk) But by undeniable Principles, *That just so Far our Church Err's, so Far it requires Unreasonable Conditions of Communion*, And next, That They, the Illuminated men of the World, have don no more, But exactly Cancelled the Errours of our Church, *leaving all untouched, that is, not Destructive to the ends of Christian Society*; For, we must believe, *They are the skilful Masters that always hit Right, Though confessedly Fallible*. You shall sooner draw pure Gold out of meer dross, Than get any Thing like a Tolerable Proof from these men, to countenance One of these Desperate Assertions. Alas, They only Word it without Proof, As Arians and Nestorians Do. And here is All you Have from Them.

3. The 3. Proposition. *Nothing can be more unreasonable, then that the Society imposing such conditions of Communion, should be judge, whether those conditions be just and equitable, or no.* I Answer. *And nothing can be proved more Unreasonable, then to make a Receding Party from an Ancient Church, a few Rebellious People against it, Judges in their own Cause.* The Arians judged thus for Themselves, and so do Protestants. All rebellion in Kingdoms and Commonwealths is Patronized, if those who Revolt may Clear Themselves from Guilt, upon their own Votes and saying: *such conditions imposed on us are Unequitable and Grievous; We therefore, who Rebel, will sit upon the Bench and Judge so.* The Kingdom (Believe it) is to Decide in such Cases, and not the Rebel's, And so the Church is to Judge you, As it did the Arians, And not you The Church. Your Complaint of unequitable Conditions imposed on you, is

And therefore may more likely spoil Them, mend what they Conceive Amis.

The proposition supposes what is to be

Rebells are not to be Judges in Their own Cause,

Not Protestants of Their Schism. The Church is to Judge in this Cause of Schism.

only an Unproved Fancy, begot in your Non-age, when you never Heard good Word of Rome; Passion still foment's it, Sophistry Advanceth it, but All will not Do. Most truly, That Talk of *unjust Conditions* is Meerly a mask to Cover an Unjustifiable Schism, a Pretense to Defend what cannot be Defended. Pull the Visard of, which is don by putting you to the *Proof of your Talk*, and the Proposition Appears in its own Likenes, Ugly, and Deformed.

The Plea of unjust Conditions, only a Mask of an unjustifiable Schism.

4. The fourth Proposition. *Where there is sufficient evidence from Scripture, Reason, and Tradition, That such things, which are imposed, are unreasonable conditions of Christian Communion; The not communicating with that Society, which requires those things, cannot incur the guilt of Schism. Here wants a Minor, which I shall supply with a contradictory Proposition thus. But there is no sufficient Evidence from Scripture, Reason and Tradition, That such Things Imposed on Protestants by the Church of Rome, are Unreasonable*

A General task of unreasonable conditions, Prooves.

Conditions of Christian Communion; Therefore Protestants not Communicating with that Ancient Society, which justly requires those Things, cannot but make them Guilty of Schism. Who must now judge between us? Or, Finally say, whether that Major, or, This contrary Minor carries the greater weight of Truth with it?

What Savaries say in this Proposition, Any Heretic may Assert and as probably

The first is only a Supposed and an unproved Assertion, That both Arians and all condemned Hereticks may vent against us. The Minor is Grounded upon the acknowledged Ancient Purity of our Church, Which, Vnles clear Evidence Overtrow it, cannot but Defend it self as strongly Against such Calumnies (upon its own Prepossessed Right and Innocency) As the best of Kingdoms doth against a company of known Rebels.

When

When Therefore These Novellists Pretend to have sufficient Evidence from *Scripture, Reason, and Tradition* for *Unreasonable Conditions* imposed, They are Obligated, to Descend to Particulars, And make the Charge Good by valid Proofs, reducible at last to Ovrned, and allow'd of Principles amongst Christians. If this be not Don, They may Vapour against our Church, as the Jews Do against christ, But shall never Advance so far, as to a weak Probability, or make an End of one sole controversy. What Se-
culars are
Obliged to
do, by more
then Talk
only.

And mark what Doings we have Here. They will have no Judge on Earth; Clear Principles Fail Them in every Controversy, And yet we must Hear (and only in a General way) Of sufficient Evidence Drawn from *Scripture, Reason, and Tradition*, Against our *Unreasonable Conditions*. If there be such Evidence, Shew it, And let us se the Ovrned Principles, wheron it lastly Relies. But truely, So much ill luck Follow's them, That you never find a Controversy solidly handled, or brought (when They go about to Prove their own Doctrin Positively) to any thing like a Proof, or Principle, They make
Controversies
Endless. And They are as unfortunate, when They Oppugn Their
want of
Principles,
only Can-
sell Proo-
fes Talk. Ours.

5. The fifth Proposition. By how much the Societies are greater, which are agreed in not Communicating with a Church imposing such conditions, By how much the power of those who rule those Societies so agreeing is larger; By so much the more justifiable is the Reformation of any Church from those Abuses, and the setting the bonds of christian Communion without them. Suppositions
without
Proofs. Here is the Thesis, And a Thing, like an Hypothesis, comes limping After, as well as it can; Thus, What are
these Abu-
ses? Who is
to reform? On these grounds, the Church of Rome Imposing unlawful conditions of Communion, it was Necessary not to communicate with her,

384 Disc. III. C. XIV. Protestants cannot clear

her, and on the Church of Englands power to reform is self by assistance of the supream power, it was lawful and justifiable not only to redress those Abuses, but so settle the Church upon its proper and true Foundations, so that the Church of Rome's imposing unlawful conditions of communion, is the reason why we do not communicate with Her; and the Church of Englands power to govern and take care of her self, is the Reason of our joining together in the service of God, upon the Principles of our Reformation. Did you ever Hear men Vapour much, Talk much, Suppose much, and Prove just nothing? Here you have them. Observe it. We Hear a Noise of Unlawful imposed Conditions, of great Abuses in our Church, of the English Churches Power to Redress these Abuses, Yet, no man Knows, nor shall ever know by any solid Proof, what these Conditions and Abuses are; Much less, That a few Protestants have power to Redress them, were there any such in the Church, where of more Hereafter.

They pretend to settle, and have no Ground to build on.

What are these Principles? Name one.

Were there Abuses in the Church, Protestants have not Principles to redress them.

More Oppose these Sectaries Reformation, then approve it.

6. At present, to Answer the Difficulty, I will say two Things. The first. If the Power, Number, or Largenes of these pretended Reformers justify Their Reformation, it's more then evident, That a Far greater Power, Number, and Largenes of those who Oppose it, makes it Unjustifiable. Now not only Catholicks, But all the Christians in the World (Altogether more Powerfull, Larger, and Learned then a few Protestants) Stiffly Oppose this late Reformation, as an Heretical and Schismatical Novelty. Therefore, that little Justification, which their own Power and Largenes Gain's to Protestancy, is not only much weakened, But made Null, by a greater Power, that withstands it. I say 2. This Proposition is utterly Fals, and Becaus Fals, cannot be

be Proved : *Viz.* That, by how much Societies are greater, and their Power larger in Agreeing, not to Communicate with an Ancient Church, wherein They were Baptized; By so much more Justifiable, is their Pretended Reformation. For, the Society of *Arians*, which Agreed in not Communicating with the Church of Rome, was more Numerous, Greater, and Powerful then ever Protestants were in England; They had their Emperours, Their Bishops, Their Councils, Their Churches, and a World of Followers. Say therefore, I Beseech you, did their Number, Power, or Greatnes. Justify either their Heresy or Schism? Or, doth the greater Power, and Number, of Agreeing Rebels in a Kingdom against Their lawful Sovereign, Justify that Treason? You will Say. The *Arians* Erred, But Protestants hit right on the Roman Abuses, and this makes their Reformation Justifiable. Meer Prooffes, empty Words; For, do you not se (and evidently) That all you Speak to this sence, is a wretched Supposition, and a pure Begging of the Question? And Becaus it is so, can either We, or any third Indifferent Judge Believe you sooner, speaking in your own Cause, then credit an *Arian* that will say the very same For his Heresy? O, But Confessedly both Catholicks and Protestants acknowledge the *Arians* to be Hereticks. And as Confessedly both Catholicks and *Arians*, yes, And all other Sectaries Say also, you are Hereticks. What Therefore get you by this Reply? Will you Tell us next, That you are Better at your Proofs against us, then the *Arians* are? The *Arians* laugh at you, And say, with Truth, *This very Assertion is Prooffes*. Believe it. Though the Arguments of *Arians* against our

It is not true, that by how much Societies are more Numerous and greater, by so much more Their Schism is Justifiable.

This Truth is clear in the Arians,

And in Rebels also of a Commonwealth,

The Prooffes Talk of Sectaries,

The Arguments of Arians are more difficult. It then roars Protestants yet Proposed against our Church Doctrin. Ancient Church, whereof they were once Members, are both Deficient and Strengthles; yet They go far deeper into Difficulties, which look more manly On's, then as hitherto any Protestant hath Proposed against us. If you say: This is my own unproved Assertion, I will first Appeal to the Judgement of any Indifferent and Unconcerned Scholler for sentence in the case: Next (if this like you not) Be you first Pleas'd, to Propose one of the strongest Arguments you have, Against any particular Doctrin of the Roman Catholick Church (One I say, and in Form) which may at last be Driven to an owned Principle, And then (Though I do Anathematize The Heresy) I shall Advance an Other in Behalf of the Arians; And if this, in the Judgement of every good Scholler, do not more Puzzle you in your own Principles, then yours me, against the Church, I'll

The Grounds of the Assertion are declared. yield up the cause. Here is fair Play offered. The ground of my Assertion is first. Because Protestants cannot so much as Probably solve the Arians Difficulties, without Recurring to the Churches infallible Interpretation of Scripture, which they Reject. 2. Neither Catholicks nor any, can Solve them Otherwise (then only Negatively) That is by shewing they do not Convince, But to Infringe their Force Positively, Or, To

Sollaries cannot solve the Arians Arguments without recurring to our Churches infallible Interpretation of Scripture. Evidence them fals, Abstracting from Tradition and the Authority of the Church (which is more the Proof of Catholick Doctrin, then a Direct Solution to difficulties) is Impossible. Now, on the Other side, Protestants can Propose no Difficulty Against us for Protestancy; But we will first Shew it Negatively Unconcluding, And next by Positive Proofs break in pieces the Seeming Force of it. For example. They Argue

The Reason why Arians Difficulties are harder then those of Protestants, Negatively and Positively Protestants Arguments are Solved.

Disc..III.C.XIV. *Themselves of Schism.* 387

Argue against the Real Presence : *A body cannot be in two places at Once.* We Show first *Negatively*, that their Argument concludes not, and then Introduce *Positive* Proofs, partly drawn from Gods *Omnipotency*, partly from other Undeniable Grounds, Which both weaken and Dead the Argument. And thus we Proceed with them in Other Controversies, Concerning the *Popes Supremacy*, *Praying to Saints*, *Purgatory* &c.

7. I have Complained all along, of our Adversaries Asserting much, and Proving Nothing, You will yet see more of this Proceeding in some, who Think They strongly Vindicate the Church of England from the Guilt of Schism.

C H A P. XV.

More of These Authors Confused Doctrine, is Refuted.

1. **I**N a Chapter Intituled : *Protestants not Guilty of Mr. Stile's Schism.* The Catholick Opponent Argues. *If King Henry the Roman Church was corrupted in Doctrine, it Follow's, That for many Ages before Luther, there was not one Visible and Orthodox Church throughout the whole World. And consequently, during that Time, Every good Christian was obliged in some point or other to Contradict the Doctrine, and Desert the Communion of all Visible churches in the World. Which I say cannot but Imply a Leaving of, And also a strong Opposition Against the Church Catholick, What ever this*

One Example Hereof.
If all particular Churches were corrupted in Doctrine, the

C c c 2

Catho.

whole Catholick Church was also corrupted.

Therefore upon the Supposition men are obliged to desert the Communion of the Catholick Church. He Grant's no particular Church was free from Error. They say, all Churches had erred. It is necessary to separate from all erring Churches, therefore as necessary to separate from the whole Catholick Church. What Scholars Really

Catholick Church be; For, this Catholick Society is not a Chimæra in the Ayr, But is Essentially Constituted of either Pure, or Particular tainted Churches. Now our Adversaries say, All particular Churches throughout the whole World, were tainted; Ergo, what ever is meant by the Catholick Church, was also corrupt and Tainted. Yet more. I am Obligated to Desert all Corrupted Churches, Therefore I am obliged to Abandon the Communion of the Church Catholick. After much Talk and Quibbling about the Meaning of one Visible Church, and the Errors of particular Churches, whether Several, or the same in particular Societies of Christians, &c. These men Grant, That there was not One Church, of any Distinct Communion from others, free from Errors. The Arians, the Nestorians, the Eutychians, the Greeks, the Abyssins, Hussites, And finally Catholicks Had Erred. Therefore all the Churches in the World, consequently the Catholick Church, had erred before Luther: But it is Necessary to Separate from the Communion of all Erring Churches, Therefore, 'Tis as Necessary to Separate from the Communion of the whole Catholick Church.

2. To This Argument They Answer. There can be no Separation from the whole Church, But in such Things, wherein the Unity of the whole Church lyes &c. Now, When men Separate from the Errors of all particular Churches, They do not Separate from the whole, Because those Things, which one Separates from those particular Churches for, are not such as make them, all put together, to be the whole, or Catholick Church. For a further Explanation They tell us: Two Things may be Considered in all particular Churches; One, that Belongs to them as a Church, The other, that belongs to them as a particular

lar church. What belongs to them as a Church, Implies the Common Ligaments or grounds of Union betwixt all particular Churches, which taken all Together make up the Catholick Church: Now these which belong to it as a particular Church, are such, as it may retain the Essence of a Church without them. And therefore supposing, That I should Separate from all particular Churches, I do not Separate from the communion of the whole Church, Unless it be for something, without Which, those could be no Churches.

3. Here in brief is their Confused, Unproved, and Fals Doctrin. I call it confused, Because, when They Tell us: There can be no Separation from the whole Church, But in such Things wherein the Vnity of the whole Church lyes, They should Declare Expressly, and Particularly, wherein that Vnity of the whole Church Consists: But to leave us in Darknes Concerning no man knows what Ligaments, and Pretended Vnity of a Strange Imagined Catholick Church, without Saying How far these Ligaments reach, or, wherein precisely This exact Vnity lyes, is only to Turn us of with Talk, and Teach just nothing. If They Answer: The Vnity of this Doctrin is found in the Fundamentals of Faith, we are yet as far to seek as Before; For, who Knows what these new Protestants will make Fundamental, and Unfundamental Doctrin? They may say one thing to day is Fundamental, and change it to morrow. However, Admit that They Declare Themselves, and Tell us Punctually, so much and no More is the Fundamental and Necessary Doctrin of the Catholick Church, it will be only their Own Supposed, and Unproved Assertion, and Occasion anew as hot a Dispute, as Any other Controversy

This Doctrin of Separation is Confused, unproved, and fals.

They speak confusedly of unknown Ligaments, and of an unknown Vnity.

No man can imagine what They will make Fundamental.

And if we could it would only be their own unproved Fancy.

troverſy between us. So Vnfortunate are *theſe Men* in every Thing they Say (and it cannot be otherwiſe) for wanting Ground to Build on, and a Church to regulate Their Faith, Whatever They Vent againſt our Catholick Doctrin, muſt of Neceſſity be as Much Their own *Suppoſed and Unproved Fancy*, As if an *Arian* Diſputed Againſt us.

4. Obſerve Yet, How They Still run on with theſe unproved Suppoſitions. *When men, Say They, ſeparate Themſelves from the Errours of all Particular Churches, They do not Separate from the whole &c.* Blessed are ſuch

Proteſtants Separated and Poorly ſuppoſe, that they run away with Truth only, and leave all the Errours behind Them.

Men, But who are They for Gods ſake? Proteſtants? Yes. And I muſt take their Word for it, we have no other proof. Pray you Tell me, When that firſt Proteſtant Gyant, *Martin Luther*, ſtood up, and Separated from all the Societies of Chriſtians Throughout the whole World, from *Catholicks*, from *Arians*, *Abyſſins*, *Gracians* &c. Who Aſſured him (And here we urge for a Satisfactory Principle) or, VWho can yet Aſſure our Proteſtants, That both He and They are not More Plunged into Groſs Errours, by this wilful Divorce, Then if They had remained, as once They were, *Honeſt Catholicks*? Can I, in Reason, Suppoſe That All, and every One of theſe Societies that Quitted Rome were Corrupted in Doctrine, And without ſo much as a ſeeming Probability, Hold *Luther* and his Followers, the only *Pure and Untainted Chriſtians of the World*? Theſe are Patadoxes, and vaſt improbabilities; For if All Theſe Erred, when They left the Roman Catholick Church (As evidently They did) *What God, or Angel, was it, That Directed Proteſtants to his right every way, and to Avoid all Error?*

Who Aſſures them ſo much? or, that they are not more deeply in Error by their own wilful Separation?

theſe

These Hereticks, when They Separated, were Fallible men, and actually Erred; our Protestants are as Fallible, and may have don wors. These followed their own self Judgement in making that Divorce, Yet Missed of Truth; Protestants can only Say so much, And therefore very likely may have Missed more. How then shall we know (and by a satisfactory Proof) That this rare Reformation, which Opposed all Religions, is Untainted, and Orthodox? I'll tell you. Protestants (after an Infamy cast on all the Churches in the world) Say so, And what They say (Though whole Armies of Christians, more learned and numerous Stand against them) must be thought True. Is not this a Jolly Proof? In a word, Here is my Dilemma. Either They must Assert, that Their whole Protestant Doctrin now Established, is without Blemish, Pure, and Orthodox; or, yet Hath its Errours: if this last, It needs another Reformation: If they make it so Pure that it cannot be made better, They only say without proof, what All the Condemned Hereticks in Christendom Assert for Themselves, and Moreover will have Christians Believe The greatest Paradox ever Heard of, viz. That They Only had the good Luck to hit Right, whilst All Foregoing Sectaries, who Abandoned the Roman Church, Were, and, yet Are tainted with gross Corruptions. The Reason why both They, and All other Hereticks that left the Mother-Church, are in Errour, is drawn from the Impossibility of doing the Work They have gon about: For, it is not in mans power to change or Reform Religion. No. Only one High Priest (God and man) Once made a change, who was Holy, Innocent, Undeiled, Separated from sinners, and made Higber then the Heavens, round

Protestants
Separation
paralleled
with that
of other
Hereticks.
Protestants
proofs
their own
word, and
nothing
Else,
Whether
Protestants
dare assert
that Their
reformed
Protestancy
is so Right
that it can
not be ma-
de better?
If They
Assert, we
urge for
Principles
to prove it.
All that
formerly
deserted the
Roman
Catholick
Church er-
red, upon
what proof
are Prote-
stants Ex-
empted
from the
like Er-
rors?

One Only
High Priest
had Power
to Reform
Religion.

Heavens. Men Therefore wicked, as *Luther* was, Guilty of high Crimes, Born and Brought up in sin, and now buried in Contempt, Are unfit Instruments for such a work: They may marr Religion, but to mend it, is Impossible.

Doctrin
Common
to all Chri-
stians is not
Sufficient to
Salvation.

5. Again. That Distinction (made Above) between the Common *Ligaments* of a Church, and particular *Errors* in all Churches, Which yet do not Vnchurch Them, is *Frivolous*, *Unproved*, and most *Fals*. For, first there neither are, nor can be any Common Tyes, or Grounds of Vnion amongst all Christians now in Being, which considered by an Abstract Notion, sufficiently Constitute the *Necessary Doctrin* of the True Catholick Church. My Reason is: No Doctrin Common to *Arians*, *Nestorians*, *Catholicks*, and *Protestants*, or Vniuersally held by all Christians, can be more Proved to be saving Faith enough for Christians. Then if we *Gratis* Assert, That a belief in one God only, common to *Turks*, *Iewes* and *Christians*, is full Faith enough for us all. Scripture, as I have largely proved in a foregoing Chapter, Requires yet more Explicit Faith of many Particulars. 2. It is utterly Fals, That the True Catholick Church may be found amongst all Particular Erring Churches. The Primitive Christians were a Body apart, and as Distinct from the *Arians* in those Days, as We are now from *Protestants*. And therefore no Doctrin Common to that Church and *Arians*, was ever Thought sufficient Catholick Doctrin. Otherwise, *Arius* might have Told the *Nicene Fathers*: (yes, And These should have Assented to him) You unjustly Condemn me, For Admit, That I have my Particular *Errours*, you may have Yours Also, We are all yet of One Church, and Need not to break of

The True
Catholick
Church is
not found
amongst
Christians
That Err
in Faith.
Other wise
Arius
would not
have Erred
in matters
of Faith.

of any Catholick Unity, Becaus, though both you, and I, err, We may yet retain the Essence of a Catholick Church. Hereticks hitherto Never Plead-
ed thus for their Cause, But as Pertinaciously Defend-
ed their Private Opinions, as They did the Com-
mon Doctrin of all Christians. Only our Prote-
stants, now Pressed with Vnanswerable Arguments,
concerning the plain Naming of a Catholick Church befo-
re *Luther* (like men living by shifting) Seek out a
woful Subterfuge, and make all Erring Churches part-
ly good, and Catholick, in the Common Ligaments of
Christianity; And partly *Naught and Heretical*, in Their
particular Errours, Whereas the Spouse of *christ*, is but
One Immaculate moral Body, and can be no More
Tainted with Errour, then the pure Primitive Church
was; No, nor more Corrupted then the whole Bible
now is, and yet remain Purely Gods Word. 3. Grant
(which is the greatest Chimera Imaginable) That the
Common Ligaments and Grounds of Catholick Faith,
are to be found amongst all the erring Societies of
Christians, Protestants have yet an endles Task in
hand, Which is to Perswade All men Opposit to
them, That They, by their Discerning Spirit, Have just
hit the nail on the Head, And taken so much to Themsel-
ves as is Purely Catholick Doctrin, without Mixture of
Errour with it. Believe me, it will be hard to pro-
ve so much done; And if They Prove it not by Unde-
niable Principles, Farwell Protestants say I: For They
may be more in Errour by Their late Reformation,
Then all those Erring Churches together, Which They
have gon about to Reform.

*Hereticks
as strongly
defend
their parti-
cular Er-
rors as the
Common
Doctrin of
Christia-
nity.*

*The entire
purity of
the Church
Necessary.*

*Protestants
cannot pro-
ve that
they have
taken so
much Do-
ctrin to
themselves
as is purely
Catholick.*

6. In another Chapter Intituled *the Reformation of the*
D d d Church

Neither
Proof nor
Inference
Good.

Church of England justified. These very men (after they had made the Catholick Church like a Common field layd open to all those Inhabitants (who own the Fundamentals of Christian Faith) Tell us, That the Roman Church stand's Guilty of the violation of Publick Rights, and Add's many Particular Doctrins, many Superstitious Practises which have no Foundation in Scripture, or Consent of the Primitive Church; Therefore this Roman Church is Separated from the Communion of the Catholick Church, And so is become Schismatical.

But their Church of England hath his Rights, and is only so far Separated from Rome, as Rome hath Devided Her self from the Belief of the Vniversal Church. What have we here? A Cluster of meer superfluous Words. I am Astonished to Se men run on, with such proofles Generalities. However, We will have Patience, and friendly Ask: How far is that large field of the Catholick Church to be extended? Point

Not one of
These par-
ticulars can
be proved
by certain
Principles.

out the Limits of it? Name those Christians and Them only, who Inhabite that large field? What are those Fundamentals of Faith? How many are there of Them, ninety nine, or a Hundred? Specify, with a Proof at the end of it (but Proofs are now out of fashion with Protestants) Those particular Fals Doctrins of the Roman Church so contrary to Scripture. Say once Plainly, what that Catholick Church is, From which Rome Separated, and something is Don?

But above all, make good your wild Assertion, That just so far you are Devided from Rome, (not one Inch more or less) as Rome is Separated from the Vniversal Catholick Church.

Three Pro-
positions to
be proved.

To do this, justice Requir's an exact Proof of these three Things. First, That you particularly Shew us, What, or how much the Precise Doctrin of that imagined Catholick Church is, which dwell's in your Fancy.

2. Wherein the

the Roman Church hath swerved from that true Doctrin.
 3. And this will cost you some pains, make good upon any Received Christian Principle, That you are right in your Faith, And have just Divided your selves so far from the Roman Church, as this is from Another Church, more Universal and Catholick. Could these men live to Mathusalem's Age, They would never come neer to the likelihood of a rational Proof for any one of these Particulars. I say of a Proof; For, I would have Them know, That to talk at random, and vent their own fancies as They do here, will weigh but little, when Reason comes to Ballance all with a close Arguing in good Form.

7. When again They are Told in the same Chapter, That the Separation of Protestants was not only from the Church of Rome, But, as calvin Confesseth, from the whole Christian World, which necessarily Implies a Separation from the True Catholick Church. They Answer. We have not separated from the whole Christian World in any thing, wherein the whole Christian World is Agreed. Is this so great a matter to be Praised for? Not to Separate from what men cannot Separate, if they Own Christ, and Deserve the name of Christians? Mark well, I beseech you. Neither the Arians, nor Nestorians, nor Donatists, Nor any other condemned Hereticks Separated from any Thing, wherein the whole Christian World Agreed in; For They Believed in Christ a Saviour and Redeemer, and Thus much all Christians Hold: But is This Faith enough to save us without Believing more? Pray you Answer. Again. These Hereticks Added something to that General owned Belief of All, And this got them the name of Separatists, or Hereticks, not Because they Deserted the Common Doctrin of the whole Christian World,

No Heretick Separated from the Universal Doctrin believed by all Christians.

What got them the Name of Separatists or Hereticks.

Protestants
proved
Schisma-
ticks by
Their own
Doctrin.

The Dona-
tists no
Schisma-
ticks in
Protestants
Principles.

The Dona-
tists were
Schisma-
ticks for
making the
Church
too strait,
and so are
Protestants
for making
it too wide.

World, But, becaus They Abandoned that Ancient Church, wherein they were Baptized. Protestants have Don the like in leaving the same Ancient Church, And have Added *That to Their Specifical Religion*, which was neither the Common Doctrin of All Christians, no, nor Held by any Christian Society in the World. Vpon this Account Therefore, They as justly Deserve the Name of *Heresicks* and *Separatists*, as either *Arian* or *Nestorian*. And thus much I Prove by their own Con-
cession; For They grant, that the *Donatists* were *Sepa-*
ratists and *Schismaticks*; Becaus they confined the
Catholick Church within their own Bounds of *Africa*;
Yet, by Their good leave, *These very Donatists Dissented*
in nothing that was held all over Common Christian Doctrin;
For, they Acknowledged the same *Christ* as we Do,
yet were *Hereticks* Vpon the Account of their particu-
lar Doctrin, Though They clashed with nothing held
Vniuersally. You will say, *But They did Clash*; For
without all Proof They Confined the Church to one
place Only. *contra*. And you, my good Friends,
without all Likelyhood of Proof, *make the Church a migh-*
ty wide One; You give it Arms which embrace all called
Christians, *Though Hereticks in their particular Tenents*. Did
therefore the particular Doctrin of the *Donatists* (confining
the Church to one place) Vnchurch Them; Believe it, your
Particular Doctrin in making it too Large, will Vnchurch
you also. I call both these Doctrins *Particular*, and *He-*
retical. For, *as never men before the Donatists, made the Catho-*
lick Church so strait as They did, so never Christians before these
later Protestants, made it so large as to hold in it all the Her-
eticks in the World. I say expressly: This Doctrin of the
Donatists was only their *particular Errour*, and not Their
Vniuer-

Universal, or, Common to all Christians; For, *Their very Denying the Church to be Spread the whole world over, makes that Doctrin not Vniversal, or, not Held by All.* And thus much Protestants must Say; For, whilst They (or any other Sectaries) Maintain Tenents particular to themselves (for example two Sacraments only) A Doctrin so limited, cannot be called Vniversal. Out of what is hitherto Said, we must conclude: If no Doctrin can make a man an Heretick, but the Denyal of That, which the whole Christian World Own's, *The Arians, and Nestorians were not Hereticks.*

In the Principles of Protestants the Arians and Nestorians were not Hereticks.

8. These Novellists go on Trifling in a most serious Matter, And first Tell us. Though a man Differ's from all other in Accidents; for Example in Feature, yet he leaves not of to be Essentially a man; Therefore, though Protestants Differ from all other Christians in Doctrin Accidental, or, wherein these Dissenting Societies Disagree from one another, Yet, as long as They stick to the Common owned Faith of all Christians, so long they are Safe, and Members of the Church Catholick. A miserable Put of. It Seem's, a very Universal Doctrin suffiseth Protestants to be good Catholicks. All we Desire, is, That they will exactly say, How much Precisely of this Doctrin will Serve the turn (as both Necessary and Sufficient) to make us all Catholicks? Or, whether the Arians, Nestorians or Denatists Had enough of it, so be good Catholicks? If Yes. They were both Good Catholicks and Hereticks at once; catholicks, upon the Account of Common Christian Doctrin owned by them; and Hereticks, for their particular Erroneous Tenents. And it's more then probable, that Protestants are like Them: - *Secundum quid*, Catholicks; Because of Their

A frivolous Instance. Everyone knows what is essential to a Man; But Protestants know not, how much Doctrin is Essential to Christian Faith, and how much is merely Accidental.

Arians and Protestants Symbolize.

Common Doctrin; But, Simpliciter, Hereticks, by Reason of Their late introduced Novelties.

9. They tell us Again : *The communion of the Church Catholick, is not to be measured by the particular Opinions either of All, or any particular Church, But by such things, Which are the proper Foundations of the Catholick Church; For there can be no Separation from the true Catholick Church, but in such things, wherein it is Catholick; And it is not Catholick in any thing; But in what Properly relates to its Being, and constitution.* Let the World Judge, whether

*Selfaries
waver that
only Diffi-
culty,
which re-
quires Ex-
plication.*

this be not meer Confused Talk? For the only Difficulty in this Matter is, to know of these new Doctors, How much Precise Doctrin is *Necessary* and *Sufficient* to be believed, How much of it Constitut's The *Being* and *Foundation* of the catholick Church, And what is *Accidental*, or *Vnnecessary*? You se They wave This, And content Themselves with telling us of no man knows what *Being*, of no man knows what *Foundation* of a Church, without Descending to Particulars, or Proving what these *Essentials* are; Or, Finally who Those Christians were, that were Right in the *Essentials* of Faith before *Luther*, or, had the *Being* of a Church amongst them. They Proceed here, as if a Master should tell a young Beginner with Grammer: You must learn your Rules well, and understand them perfectly; But you shall have neither Book, nor Precepts from any, wherby to Learn them. I Profess before Almighty God (and I think Thousands not only Catholicks, But others, are of my opinion) I am yet as wholly Ignorant of what These *Newer Protestants* will make the *Essentials* of Faith, the *Necessary* and *sufficient Foundations* and *Being* of a Church, as ever Boy was

*Protestants
injoyn us
to learn
that Do-
ctrin which
is Essential
to a
Church,
and allow
us neither
Master, nor
Rules to
learn it by.*

was of Grammer Rules, when he first went to School. I may perhaps Guess better at their Doctrin, And my Thought is: They Hold All the Hereticks in the world, whether *Arians* or Others, to be good Catholick Christians; Yet, dare not Publish so much in Writing.

The world would Cry Shame if they Explained their sense,

And this is the true Reason why they Schulk in *Generalities*, And hide Themselves under these universal *Vnexplained* Terms of the *Essentials* of *Faith*, of the *Being* of a church, the *Foundations* of it &c. Well, I will say it once more. If the Do-

ctrin common to all Christians, be the *Essential*, *Necessary*, and *Sufficient Doctrin* of the Church *truely Catholick*, it Follows evidently, That no Heretick was ever yet *Vnchurched* by His particular Heresy. But,

No Hereticks ever were, if Doctrin Common to all be sufficient to Salvation.

10. Woe be to Catholicks, what ever becomes of Others, They must be *Vnchurched*. For, These men Assert (and very wisely, as they Think) Although nothing Separates a Church properly from the Catholick, But what is contrary to the *Being* of it; yet a Church (And this is the Roman) may separate Her self from the Communion of the Catholick Society, By taking upon Her, to make such things Necessary Conditions of Communion, which never were the Conditions of Communion of the Catholick Church.

Observe first. A Supposition for a Proof, of strange imposed Conditions. Observe 2. A Supposition for a Proof, of no man knows what Catholick Church, Wider and larger, then the Roman. But above all,

More Suppositions past for Proofs with Solaries.

11. Observe 3. Their *unlearned Discours*. The Roman Church (say They) Draws the Bounds of Catholick Communion within Her self, and so Divides from the true Catholick Church.

They can
not name
the Ortho-
dox
Church,
from which
the Roman
Church
Separated.

Church. I Ask, From what true Catholick Church did she Divide Her self? *Speak out, And name that Church,* Design it Plainly, which was Actually Orthodox, and in Being when *Luther* Apostated, and something is said to the Purpose. If you fail to Shew us that Imagined Church, *from which you Suppose the Roman separated,* All you Assert is a meer Calumny. We say, and can Justify it, There was no such True Church in the whole World to Separate from, Vnles *Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Gracians* &c. constituted that great Imagined moral Body. But These, as is Evident, (once Catholicks) Separated from the Roman Church, not She from them; Therefore this *supposed Separation,* is only an unproved Fancy.

Grant,
what Se-
ctaries
would ha-
ve, Nothing
is Proved.

12. Yet more; And this is to Show you the strange weaknes of our Adversaries whole Discours. Let us suppose, this falsity of a true catholick church in *Luthers* Days much wider Then the Roman; withal, that the Roman was only a corrupted Part of that more Ample Church. Believe it, These men are yet far enough from Proving their Intent: For Admit, upon the Supposition, That the Church of Rome Draws the bounds of Catholick Communion within Her self, and Confin's all Truth within Her own Community: *This is only Her own particular Opinion, which Draws no more, Confines no more, Then Protestants do now.* For, do not They Profess, that the Doctrin of Christ is more Purely, and less Erroneously taught in England at this Day, Then in any other Society of Christians, That Dissent's from Them? Yes. Here then is as much Drawing of Truth to Themselves, and this Drawing consequently

Protestants
pretend as
much, to
have
Christs
verities
taught by
Them, as
Catholicks
Do;

sequently implies a great Division from that Fancied Catholic Church, Which, I am sure, *Never Taught, And consequently They Divide Them-selves from their Catholick Church.* that the Gospel of Christ is Preached most purely and without Error, amongst a few English Protestants. Meer Opinions Therefore of particular Churches (as long as the General Doctrin of all Christians Stand's unshaken) Cannot; in these mens Principles, Vnchurch any Christian Society; or, if They can, both They (I mean our Protestants) And all other Sectaries are Vn-churched, Becaus all of them Believe more, then the *General Essentials of Faith* Exact of any Christian.

13. It may be Answered. Though they believe more, Yea, And particularly hold, That Christs Doctrin is more purely Taught and believed in England, Then in other places, Yet this is not a Necessary Condition of Communion with them. No? I hope it is a Necessary condition of communion with Protestants, Though Vnnecessary for Communion with that other Fancied Vniversal Church, and the General Doctrin Therof. The Reason is. *No man can be more a Protestant, unles He Believe All particular owned Articles of that Religion as Pure, and Orthodox, Then a good Papist, and, not Believe what that Church particularly Teacheth.*

14. Now, Becaus we are got thus far into a Matter, wherein I Hold our Adversaries much Overseen; I would gladly have a clear Answer to this one Question, *Viz. Whether (after a due Proposal) it be absolutely Necessary to Saluation to Communicate with Protestants, That is, Firmly to Believe any one Article of our Protestants Reformed Faith, as it is Protestantcy?* For example: *Two Sacraments only, no Real Presence, no Sacrifice, or, what els you will?* If they Answer, Yes. Then

E e e

I Infer:

To have Communion with Protestants is, without Doubt, necessary to Believe something of pure Protestantcy.

A Question proposed not to be Answered by Sectaries.

If Doctrin
Common to
all be not
sufficient,
something
of Prote-
stancy must
be owned
necessary.

If Nothing
of Prote-
stancy be
accounted
of as Ne-
cessary, one
may abjure
all that
Religion,
and yet be
a Faithful
Believer.

A shame-
ful Schism
about Pro-
testancy,
that Teach-
es nothing
necessary to
Salvation.

We Ask not
what Pro-
testants
Judge, but
demand
for a Proof
of that
Judgement.

I Infer : The Belief of that Doctrin Universal and Common to all Christians, is not Enough to Saluation; For now They require more, Vix, a Belief of some Doctrin peculiar to Protestancy, as it is reformed. Contrarywise, if they Grant, nothing within the Bounds of pure Protestancy to be a Doctrin of such absolute Necessity to Saluation, it follows Evidently : Though a Protestant, after a perfect knowledge had of his Religion, as Reformed, doth both Abjure, and Anathematize that particular Doctrin, And Believ's only with a General Faith, Common to Arians and all other Hereticks, He may yet be saved. Because the Belief of no one Article within the Compass of protestancy, Avail's him one whit to Saluation. If so: Tell me, I beseech you, what a Religion have we Here? Shall we say, That the Authors and Professors of Protestancy have made a shameful Bustle to bring in a Novelty, which must be called the true Reformed Religion, And now Hear them Teach, That is Teaches nothing Necessary to Saluation? Grant thus much, and Throw Protestancy out of the World, Men may be saved without it.

15. Some, Perhaps, will Reply : Protestants, at least, judge, That amongst the many Religions, which now swarm in the World, Their reformed Novelty is one of the best, and the Securest way to Heaven. Alas, We enquire not what They, Meer fallible Men, Judge (Every Heretick speak's favorably in his own Cause) But we go further, and Ask into what Undoubted Principle that Judgement is finally Resolved, or, Whether These men, withall the Judgement and Learning They have, are able, Solidly, and Rationally to Prove, that Their particular Articles of Protestancy rest firmly, and

Rely

Rely upon the Object of all Faith, which is Gods certain and Divine Revelation? If this can be Don, the particular Tenents of Protestancy are as *Certain*, and consequently the Belief of Them as *Necessary* to Salvation, *As is the belief of that General Doctrin, which all Christians Own.* The Reason is clear: Becaus, the Testimony, the Authority of the same God and the same Eternal Verity (as now we must Suppose) Warrant's as well the *One, as the Other.* Again, If They say (And They must say it.) God hath not revealed in the whole Bible one Article of Protestancy, and therefore the Belief of not one reformed Article is Necessary to Salvation; It follows, That this Religion, *Thus Separated from the true center of Divine Faith (Gods infallible Revelation) is no Christian Religion at all, But stands tottering on Fancy, and fancy only; which is a great Verity.*

If Protestants can resolve the Belief of their particular Articles into Divine Revelation, it will be Necessary to Salvation.

If not, Protestancy is no part of Christian Religion.

16. Occasionally, I here Answer to a Trivial Objection of others, that much Extol the clemency of Protestants, who (like Papists) do not Excommunicate all that believe not as They Believe. Good Reason (say I;) For why should they Excommunicate any, for not Believing a Religion, which is built on Fancy? Could they judge in Conscience, or Assure us, That, what they hold, as *Secretaries*, were Revealed by God, Necessary to Salvation, or *worth Believing*; They should so far stand for *Gods Cause*, and set so great a Value on it, as to Induce all, even by spiritual Menaces (it is a Sweeter way Then to Deprive Men of their Lives and Fortunes) to embrace Their Novelties. But Alas, The real Guilt of Schism, which lyes like lead at their Harts, makes them most frigid in Advancing a Religion, laid hold on by meer chan-

The want of Zeal in Secretaries for Protestancy.

If Doctrin
Common to
all be not
sufficient,
something
of Prote-
stancy must
be owned
necessary.

If Nothing
of Prote-
stancy be
accounted
of as Ne-
cessary, one
may abjure
all that
Religion,
and yet be
a Faithful
Believer.

A shame-
ful Schism
about Pro-
testancy,
that Teach-
es nothing
necessary to
Salvation.

We Ask not
what Pro-
testants
Judge, but
demand
for a Proof
of that
Judgement.

I Infer : The Belief of that Doctrin Vniversal and Common to all Christians, is not Enough to Saluation; For now They require more, Vix, a Belief of some Doctrin peculiar to Protestancy, as it is reformed. Contrarywise, if they Grant, nothing within the Bounds of pure Protestancy to be a Doctrin of such absolute Necessity to Saluation, it follows Evidently : Though a Protestant, after a perfect knowledge had of his Religion, as Reformed, doth both Abjure, and Anathematize that particular Doctrin, And Believ's only with a General Faith, Common to Arians and all other Hereticks, He may yet be saved, Because the Belief of no one Article within the Compass of Protestancy, Avail's him one whit to Saluation. If so: Tell me, I beseech you, what a Religion have we Here? Shall we say, That the Authors and Professors of Protestancy have made a shameful Bustle to bring in a Novelty, which must be called the true Reformed Religion, And now Hear them Teach, That is Teaches nothing Necessary to Saluation? Grant thus much, and Throw Protestancy out of the World, Men may be saved without it.

15. Some, Perhaps, will Reply. Protestants, at least, judge, That amongst the many Religions, which now swarm in the World, Their reformed Novelty is one of the best, and the Securest way to Heaven. Alas, We enquire not what They, Meer fallible Men, Judge (Every Heretick speak's favorably in, his own Cause). But we go further, and Ask into what Undoubted Principle that Judgement is finally Resolved, or, Whether These men, withall the Judgement and Learning They have, are able, Solidly, and Rationally to Prove, that Their particular Articles of Protestancy rest firmly, and Rely

Rely upon the Object of all Faith, which is Gods certain and Divine Revelation? If this can be Don, the particular Tenents of Protestancy are as Certain, and consequently the Belief of Them as Necessary to Salvation, As is the belief of that General Doctrin, which all Christians Own. The Reason is clear: Because, the Testimony, the Authority of the same God and the same Eternal Verity (as now we must Suppose) Warrant's as well the One, as the Other. Again, If They say (And They must say it.) God hath not revealed in the whole Bible one Article of Protestancy, and therefore the Belief of not one reformed Article is Necessary to Salvation; It follows, That this Religion, *Thus Separated from the true center of Divine Faith* (Gods infallible Revelation) *is no Christian Religion at all, But stands tottering on Fancie, and fancy only; which is a great Verity.*

If Prove. stands can resolve the Belief of their particular Articles into Divine Revelation, it will be Necessary to Salvation.

If not, Protestancy is no part of Christian Religion.

16. Occasionally, I here Answer to a Trivial Objection of others, that much Extol the clemency of Protestants, who (like Papists) do not Excommunicate all that believe not as They Believe. Good Reason (say I;) For why should they Excommunicate any, for not Believing a Religion, which is built on Fancie? Could they judge in Conscience, or Assure us, That, what they hold, as *Sectaries*, were Revealed by God, Necessary to Salvation, or *worth Believing*; They should so far stand for *Gods Cause*, and set so great a Value on it, as to Induce all, even by spiritual Menaces (it is a Sweeter way Then to Deprive Men of their Lives and Fortunes) to embrace Their Novelties. But Alas, The real Guilt of Schism, which lyes like lead at their Harts, makes them most frigid in Advancing a Religion, laid hold on by meer chan-

The want of Zeal in Sectaries for Protestancy.


404 Disc.III.C.XV.*Of a late Authors Confused Doctrin.*
ce, and a most unfortunate Casualty. Almighty
God soften these congealed Harts by sorrowful Repen-
tance, and Forgive all Sectaries Their double great
sin, both of Schism and Heresy.



THE

T H E
FOURTH DISCOVERS
T H E
CHVRCHES EVIDENCE.
OF THE IMPROBABILITY OF
PROTESTANT RELIGION.
THE FIRST CHAPTER.

*Christs Church is Proved to be no Other;
But the Roman Catholick. Sectaries
are Convinced.*

I.  E have often made a just Exception against Sectaries in the fore-going Discourses, And you Shall have it here Again in plain Language. *Protestants, against Sectaries as They Prove not their own Religion of more fully laid forth.* Protestancy, so They never Impugn the Roman Catholick Faith by Rational Arguments, at last reducible to Undoubted Principles. Catholicks Contrarywise, Make good Their

• Ecc 3

Their Churches Doctrin by undeniable Principles, And, by manifest Proofs Evidence the Nullity of Protestants Faith. Though both these Assertions are already Demonstrated in the precedent Treatise, Yet, Becaus of the Weightines of the Matter, it will be necessary to Epitomize some Points, largely Declared above, And bring much to a Clearer view, and a more Compendious Form.

*God esta-
blished Re-
ligion with
intention to
have it
known, not
to hide it
from us.*

*Proofs
therefore, for
it cannot
fail.*

2. To do this we may Suppose. If True Religion be in the World, the wise Providence of God hath made it so Manifest to Reason by force of Rational Motives, That All may know it; For certainly God never established Religion amongst Christians with Intention to Hide it from Them, or to put it out of their Sight, *if men will follow Reason.* Proofs therefore for it, *can no more Fail.* Then Religion is self, Vnles an Infinite Goodnes (which is impossible) obliges us Vnder pain of Damnation to Embrace a Religion, which no man, after a diligent Search made by all the reason He hath, can find out.

*Wordy Ca-
vils end no
Contro-
versy.*

3. Vpon this Principle let me tell our Protestants, That They and We, are not (in so important a matter) to mispend our time, or to wrangle it out with Words. No. *Proofs must enter, if They Hold their Religion True and ours Fals;* And so They must also, *if We say the contrary.* Again: Neither of us can here proceed as

*Solid proofs
must
fory here,
and not
weak Con-
jectures.*

Schoolmen Do, when They Oppugn One an Other, and Defend their Different Opinions upon weak and Doubtful Grounds; For, if the Proofs for *Christ's* Religion be not stronger then Schoolmens often are for meer Vncertain Opinions, *We may as well, and without Offence, Reject a weak Proved Religion, as we do a weak pro-*

ved

ved Opinion. The Arguments therfore for Religion, wheron Saluation Depend's, *Are to Stand firm upon Undeniable Principles, Or; This follows: That, though God hath most clearly evidenced Religion, yet proofs are wanting to make it known, and this, whilst He will have it Known, And manifest to All.* Thus much Supposed,

4. We will First briefly Touch on a few Arguments for the Roman Catholick Faith, which are amply laid forth upon several occasions in this Treatise (I cannot Repeat All in a short *Compendium*, yet, you Shall have Enough to silence *Sectaries*). And Remember, *We speak now of the Antecedent Evidence*, which clearly shews us Christs True Church, and makes it indubitably Credible; For no Religion, As I noted above, is, *Ex Terminis*, without convincing Proofs, either *Evidently Credible, True, or False.*

*A brief
Repetition
of some few
Arguments*

5. I Say then, First. *A Church, or Religion, which Manifesteth it Self, and Proves the Doctrin it Professeth by the same Signs, Notes, and Characters of Truth, whereby the Apostolical and Primitive Church was Marked and Evidenced, is Undoubtedly True: Or, if this Proof be not valid, we may easily Deny Truth to that Apostolical and Primitive Church. Now, the only Church in the World thus Marked and Evidenced, is no Other, but the Roman Catholick Throughout all Ages. This Principle is undeniable. Deny these Marks and Signs to the Roman Catholick Church, you Deny what is Evident, Grant them, And you Admit of Popery. See Disc. I. c. 9. 10.*

*The Roman
Catholick
Church is
Evidenced
as The A-
postolical
or Primitive
Church
was.*

6. 2. *A Church, or Religion, which in every Age after Christ, Hath had a most clear, Assured, and Undeniable Evidence of Truth, which is the Glory of Miracles (Christs own Marks and cognisances) makes known the Absolute Power of God Cooperating with it, And therefore cannot but be True, Un-*

*Miracles,
Christs
own Marks
Evidence
the Roman
Catholick
Church.*

les we Think that his power Alone Divorced, as it were, from Goodnes, Did set his *Hand and Seal to meer Forged Signs*, and wrought these Wonders to Deceive the World. *But the Roman catholick Church, And She only, clearly Demonstrat's Vnparalleled Miracles, not in One, But in every Age, As is without Controversy Proved by undoubted Records,* (which Truth I engage to make Good, if any Doubt of it) *Therefore, either This Church, or None, is Christs True Church.*

They are undeniable.

And above all other Proofs most Convincing.

Other Proofs more lyable to Cavils.

None can require, that All and Every one of this Church work Miracles.

I call Miracles the most Forceable, and Perswasive, Arguments of Truth, that can be Proposed. All other Proofs, Though clear and Convincing to *Disinterested Judgements*, being lyable to Cavils: For, cite Scripture against Sectaries, wilful *Misinterpretations Abuse it*. Produce Fathers and Councils, They are either Rejected by these men, *as Fallible, or Drawn to a Sinister Sense, as Fancy will have it*. Tell Them of the Sanctity of our Church; They Answer, Much of it may be Hypocrisy. Insist upon that great Work of Conversions, some reply, Policy and Humane Industry had a strong hand in Them. But, when we Come to the *Proof of Proofs*; And plead our Cause by *Known and most Evidenced Miracles*, all Mouths are stopped, Envy it self is Silenced, And cannot speak a Probable word against us: Vnles Perhaps some require (and most unreasonably) *That every One within this Moral body should work Miracles*, which is meerly to cavil; For, in the Primitive times, All had no such Priviledge. *It is Therefore sufficient, That there be some Chois and Selected Persons, Vnited in Faith with this Church, to whom God Communicat's the Grace, and Do These Wonders*. Se more of this Subject, *Disc. i. c. 10. n. 15. 16. 17.*

7. 3. *A Church, which hath Converted whole Kingdoms and*

Disc. IV. C. I. To be the Roman Catholick. 409

and Nations from Infidelity to Christ, And Drawn Innumerable Souls from a Tepid life to Penance and Austerity, From the Contents of the World to a Contempt of it, From Self-love to a Perfect Self-Abnegation, Must either be deservedly named the True Church of Christ, Or, the Apostolical Church Proved not its Truth, by such Admirable and Miraculous Conversions. The Church of Rome only, Hath, by the Assistance of God Don these Wonders; Therefore, it is the True Church, or, there was never any true upon Earth. Deny these Conversions made by our Catholick Society, you Deny what is most Evident; Grant Them, You subscribe to Popery. See Discours 1. c. 7. and chap. 9. n. 10.

8. 4. A Church which Opposed All the Sectaries in the World since Christianity Began, And was never Opposed by any Author of credit, or, Orthodox Society of Christians, But only by Known Condemned Hereticks, most Evidently Professeth True Religion: The Roman Church only hath, Age after Age made this Opposition against Sectaries, and never was Opposed by any; But known Hereticks. This is an Vndeniable Proof, for the Truth it Mantains. Disc. 1. c. 7. n. 5.

9. 5. A Religion, which hath Had in all Ages, most Indubitably, more illustrious marks and signs of Truth Accompanying it, Then all the other Sects in the World put Together, Either ought to be Owned for Christs Sole and Pure Religion, or, We must say, That God can make a Fals Heretical Sect more Credible, Clear, and Evident to Reason, by Signs of Truth and Sanctity, Then his True Orthodox Religion is. Reflect seriously. Can We Think that Miracles, Conversions of souls, Casting out of Devils, Great Austerity of life, Efficacy of Doctrin &c. Once convincing Arguments of Truth in the first Ages, are now Shewed us in the Roman Catholick Church so favor such Errours as Sectaries impute to it, or, so

Admirable Conversions wrought by the Roman Catholick Church, as well prove it Orthodox as the Primitive Church.

The Roman Catholick Church Opposed all known Sectaries, And no Orthodox Society ever opposed it.

A manifest Proof of Truth.

The Marks of Truth more manifest in the Roman Catholick Church, then in any other Society.

Could not be permitted by God to cheat the world.

410 Disc. IV. C. I. *Christs Church proved*

Countenance any thing like Antichristian Doctrin? To judge so, is an Improbable Paradox, And here you have an Other most evident Proof, and Principle, For the Truth of Catholick Religion. *Disc. 1. c. 7. n. 8.*

The Evident Servitude done for God by the Roman Catholick Church, Without Note of Dishonor put on it by any Orthodox Society, Proves

is Pure and Holy. A Church Once True is still True.

It taught not Christians for a time only, and then left off to be true. Reasons of the Assertion laid forth.

10. 6. *A Church, which hath manifestly Don great Service for God, by defeating his Enemies, And gaining him Friends, And yet Labours to Do him more Service: A Church, which never had Note or Mark of Dishonor put on it, Censure, Private or Publick, Issuing from any Universal Church, is Blamless, Pure, Holy, and Vncorrupt in Doctrin. In all, The Roman Catholick Society justly Glories, which, No other Sect called Christian can Do. And, 'Tis an Vndeniable Proof For its Integrity. Disc. 3. c. 8. n. 2. 3.*

11. 7. *A Catholick Church Established by Almighty God, And therefore Once True, must (upon the same Grounds which then Proved it Orthodox) ever after be Acknowledged as True. Hear my Reasons, 1. That infinite Wisdom which Founded this Once True Church, made it a School, not to Teach a Few first Christians, Or For a Time only, But to Instruct All, And for ever. The Word of our Lord Remains for ever, And this is the Word, that is Evangelized among you, 1. Pet. 1. v. 25. That Word then, which Those Primitive Christians learned yet Remains, And is now Taught by the same true, and Indeficient Church, Founded by Christ. 2. The Gifts of God, Rom. 11. 29. are without Repentance (That is unchangeable;) What ever Therefore Moved an Infinite Wisdom to make a Church once True, or, for a time, Evidently Shewes that Mercy farther Extended, and Continued to the end of the World. 3. The Necessity of Having Christians Instructed in Truth, (Souls are now as Dear to God, and as well Provided of means to Attain Salvation,*

vation, as the Primitive Christians were) Requires the continuance of Truth in that Church, which Christ first Founded. He Will's All to be saved, and come to the knowledge of Truth, 1. Tim. 2. 3. If All; None at this very Day, are Excluded from the Means of learning Christ's Verities, Taught only in that Church, which He established. 4. The consolation of Grace (Sectaries say it) Permanently Remains with Christ's Church For Ever; Therefore, Truth also is as Permanent, And as Inseparable from it; Truth being as Necessary to a Church as Grace is. 5. The Rock which is Christ, Stand's Immovable and Unshaken; Therefore the true Church Built upon this Rock and Corner-stone, 1. Cor. 10. Can no more Fail, or fall from Truth, Then Christ can leave of to be an Inefficient Verity. To say then, That God once Founded his true Church upon the Rock Iesus Christ, And grant, That afterward He Permitted either Men or Devils to Pull it down, to Deface it with Errour and fals Doctrin, is so Desperate a Paradox, That, I think, no Christian dare Avouch it in such Terms.

Grace Remained with this Church, Therefore Truth also.

12. Now mark my Inferences, upon These premised Considerations, The Roman Catholick Church was Once the True Church (Sectaries Confess it) Once it was Built on Christ, Once it Taught Christian Verities without Errour, Once it was Owned by Christians for Christ's School, Once it Evangelized the Word of God Purely. Therefore if God be yet as favorable unto Souls as He was Anciently, If He Subtract not Means from us Necessary to Salvation; if his Gifts be unchangeable, If his Intention of sowing Truth for ever amongst Christians Alter not; If He Bless his own Society as well with Truth, as with the Consolation of Grace;

Inferences upon the premised Considerations.

This Catholick Roman Church, And no Other, Once True, Was, Is, and Shall ever be so, for the Future. Ecclesia invicta res est, They are known words of a great Doctor, etsi infernus ipse commoveatur. The Church is invincible And continues the same, Although Hell is self be moved, and Struggle Against it. We may Thank Eternally our Blessed Lord for that great Verity registred in the Gospel: porta inferni non prevalebunt adversus eam. Upon this, we Ground our Faith, And Therefore you Have here Vndeniable Principles. Disc. 1. c. 3. n. 2. 3. and Disc. 2. c. 9. n. 8. Now, if to Weaken these Arguments, Sectaries will pretend to another Catholick Church more Ample then the Roman, Se them clearly Confuted. Disc. 3. c. 1. Per totum.

No other Church but the Roman Catholick.

Sectaries cannot probably say when Our Church brought in the Novelties laid to its charge.

The Ancient Possession of Truth allowed this Church, is a stronger Proof, Then Sectaries contrary Cavils.

Antiquity Owns the Doctrine of the Roman Catholick Church.

13. 8. *A Church or Religion, which was once confessedly Orthodox, And no man can probably say, when it ceased to be so, Or, When it brought in such Visible and Perceptible Novelties, as Sectaries charge on it by meer Unproved Calumnies, is Evidently a True Church still.*

The sole Voice of this Ample, learned, Roman Society (Had we no more) which cryes out against These Fancied Cavils, And the Ancient Possession of Truth Allowed it in Foregoing Ages, will be Judged in any Tribunal of the World, a more convincing Proof, An incomparable greater Testimony For its Perseverance in Christs Doctrine, Then a few blind Guessees of Sectaries can be to the Contrary, Which when they are Resolved, come to no more, but to Calumnies, or Strong Fancies. Disc 3. c. 9. n. 5.

14. 9. *A Church whose Doctrine, when you read Antiquity, whether Councils, Fathers, or History, you find so undeniably Owned and Univerally Professed, That the man is blind, who sees not Popery maintained all along Those learned*

Disc. IV. C. I. To be the Roman Catholick. 413

learned Volumes : For example; Who see's not, But, That a Sacrifice Daily Offered upon the Altar, Praying to Saints, Prayers for the Dead, The Real Presence And the like, are Doctrins plainly Delivered by Antiquity? Now, Such a Church, which upon its own Authority also, Defend's These Verities ('Tis the greatest on Earth) cannot be Vainquished by a few weak Cavils of our lately Vnknown, and Vnauthorized Sectaries. The Principle is Vndeniable. Disc. 1. c. 6.

15. 10. *A Church, That hath had, Age after Age, The both whole multitudes of Wise, Learned, and most Holy Professors (the Number of them is numberles) That, without Fright or Fear of any Delusion, lived ioyfully and dyed Happily in their Ancient Professed Faith, Cannot, But upon the very Testimony of these Witnesses, so many (And so rarely Qualified) be Iudged Evidently Credible, True, Pure, and Holy. Other- wise we must Say, That, all These learned men for a thousand years and more were Mad, Besotted, and Seduced with Foole- ries, which is so Desperate a Proposition, That None shall Dare to Vent it, and speak Probably. The Roman Catho- lick Church Alone, Produceth such Choise, Learned, and Con- tinued Witnesses for its Truth, No other Sect comes neer it; None can Parallel it. A most convincing Proof, An un- deniable Principle. Disc. 1. c. 6. n. 12.*

16. 11. *A Church, That Evidently Demonstrat's all Other called Christians From Luther Vpward, to Have been Schisma- ticks, Hereticks, or both, is either to be Owned for the true Or- thodox Church of Christ, or we must Grant, That Christ had no True Church on Earth for so long a time of a Thou- sand Years. The Roman Catholick Church Demonstrat's this clearly. And it is an Vndeniable Principle. Disc. 3. c. 1.*

17. 12. *A Church, which Confessedly Demonstrat's its An- tiquity, Hereticks;*

The Roman Church only Demonstrates with Antiquity a lawful Mission of Pastors, Unity of Doctrine, and a continued Succession of Popes, Prelates, and innumerable Professors. Cavils cannot overturn an Evident Verity. One Verity is, that God could not permit so Learned a Church, as the Roman is, to be beguiled with fooleries for so vast a time. Another Verity. If the Roman Cath. Church be falsely supposed to have Erred. Protestants cannot pro-

tiquity, Proves its Mission, Evidences its Unity in Doctrine, And Shows a continued Succession of Popes, Prelates, Pastors, and Innumerable Professors, ever since Christianity began without Interruption, Hath so great Evidence for the Truth it Teaches, That, all the Cavils of Sectaries, Pretending a change of Doctrine made in this Society, are Weak, Proofless, and Highly improbable. The Roman Catholick Church Proves these Particulars. Disc. I. c. 9. n. 8. 14.

18. To end, I say three Things. 1. No Cavils can Evert an Evident Verity, But it is an Evident Verity, That God (essentially Goodnes it self) could not Permit so Learned, so Numerous, so Excellent, and Precious a part of Christians, as the Roman Pastors, and Doctors were, from the fifth Age to Luther to be All Beguiled with Fals Doctrine: Neither could He Suffer Those Innumerable Christians, who were Taught by such Wise and Learned Pastors for a Thousand years, to be all Misled by means of Their fals Doctrine, or Cheated into Errour. This is impossible, Vnles we grant (which is a Blasphemy) That an infinite Goodnes utterly Deserted his Church, and Preserved None True on Earth, for so long a time.

19. 2. This is an undeniable Verity. If the Roman catholick Church erred, as Sectaries Assert, These men cannot by Their own Discerning Spirit, much less by an owned Principle probably say, How far, or wherein it Erred, For example (And I urge them to Answer the Difficulty) why say They, That our Church more Erred in believing the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, Then in Believing a Trinity of Persons in one Essence? They cannot by any Proof but Fancy only, more Espy Errour in the One, Then in the Other. Therefore, whilst They believe a Trinity, and other Doctrins Common with This supposed Erring Church (and indeed,

indeed, They must hold them on this Churches Authority only, or cannot Believe Them) They may be as well Plunged into Errour by owning a Trinity, as They think this Church is Deceived, in Holding the other Mystery of the Sacrament. Se these two Points further explicated Disc. 1. c. 6. n. 12. 13.

20. 3. It is an Undeniable Verity, that Christ once promised to be with the Church He Founded to the end of the World, which was the Roman catholick Church. Now Protestants must say that Christ Stood not to his Word; For certainly when He made this Promise, He well Foresaw, That, the Roman Catholick Church would (if Protestants speak Truth) at last, about the fifth or sixth Age, Become Erroneous, and consequently forsake the Good Master that founded it. With this Church then, Which Abandoned Truth, Christ, who is Truth, Remained not; nor, with any other Society of Christians for Ten whole Ages, Because All these were Professed Heresicks, and Christ never Taught Heresy, Or assisted Hereticks in their Doctrin. Therefore, He did not only promise what he Ner'e Intended to Perform, But more; even now Glorious, as He is, in Heaven, He Wink's at these Hideous supposed Errours of his (once) own founded Catholick Church, And Remedies none, Poor souls are Beguiled to this Day, with the fals Doctrin of that Church which He Established in Truth, And Promised to Assist for ever. Are These, Think ye, Probabilities? No. They are the most Pernicious Doctrins That ever entred into a Christians Hart, or Tongue Expressed.

21. If Protestants shall Pleas to make any Exception against these Proofs, Give me leave to Assure them first. I will not take their bare Word for any Thing They say

bably say how far or wherein in erred. What They are to prove and by solid Principles.

A Third Verity. Christ promised to be with the Church he founded to the End of the world. Yet Protestants must say, He Stood not to his Word.

Yes and now winks at all the supposed errors of his once own Founded Catholick Church.

Vast Improbabilities.

say against us. 2. To Fore warn Them of a usual Fallacy, And it is, That They run not here into tedious Generalities and Talk in the Ayr, which only confound's a Reader, and leaves him at last as much Dissatisfied, as when He first Began to Read. And hence I Tell them, 3. They are obliged to Answer directly without *Ambages*, I, or, No. Let them say Plainly, These Proofs are Good, or, shew them to be Fallacious; and if they Hold them Fallacies, *Let this be Evidenced by Contrary clear Proofs, grounded on Received Principles.* Thus We Proceed.

Proofs and
Principles
Paralleled.

22. For Example we say : *This is an Undoubted Principle* (we are here forced Again to Parallel Proof with Proof and Principle with Principle) *that the Apostolical Church Evidenced by Miracles, great Sanctity of life, Efficacy of Doctrin, Admirable Conversions &c. Proved it self by these very Marks and Signs, to be no Counterfeit, But a True Orthodox Church.* And Here is an Other sure Principle Laid by it. *The Roman Catholick Church (And no other Society of Christians) Hath Age, after Age, Evidenced it Self by the very like Signs of undoubted Miracles, of Admirable Conversions, of Efficacy in Doctrin, of Dispossessing Devils &c. This whole learned Society Own's these Wonders, They have been, and yet are Manifest to mens eyes and senses. The Ancient Miracles and Conversions Stand upon certain Record : Authors of unquestionable Fidelity Recount the later, Not only Friends, but Enemies allow so Allow them so much credit, That they justly Deem the Man neer a Degree of Madnes, That shall Offer to Deny All That are on Record. Therefore The Church, which Hath Ever Manifested, And yet Doth Manifest These Wonders, Proves its Doctrin in that Manner As the Apostles and Primitive Church Proved theirs. Observe now well. If Sectaries*

Proofs for
Miracles
and Con-
versions
wrought by
the Roman
Catholick
Church.

go about to Infringe the Validity of this One Proof, or will yet Deny these Miracles and Conversions wrought by our Church, They are obliged to Ground that Denial on a Proof as Strong (if not Stronger) as is This Cloud of Witnesses produced by Catholicks, For the Contrary Affirmative: And this is not only Improbable, But wholly Impossible. It is therefore meer Talk at Random, to Tell us, As They are wont: Many Miracles have been Fained: Senses may be Deceived: Papists are too Credulous: Historians sometimes Recount Things upon too slight credit. All are weightles Words, unproved Guesses, Thoughts of Fancy, and Fancy only, As wide from Proofs and Principles, as Truth is from Heresy. *Disc. I. c. 9.*

23. Again it is an Evident Truth, That the Roman Catholick Church hath Don God Great Service, And never was Censured by any Universal Church. Say Therefore, upon what Owned Principle can Protestants Deny this Good service Don for God? Upon what undoubted Proof Dare they so freely Censure and condemn it? I'll tell you, their own Saying Dorth All. They have no Better Proof.

24. 3. It is a most Evident Truth, That all those Wise and Learned Doctors, That Taught Christians Popery for a Thousand years and more, Were neither Fools nor mad men, nor Universally blinded with Errour. If this be not Evident, thus Much certainly is. The wise Providence of God never suffered those whole Millions of Christians Instructed by these Teachers to be cheated so long, and Abused with Foolerries. Now my harty Wish is, That our Adversaries will Once plainly Tell us by what Proof or Received Principle they are able to convince, That all These Learned Doctors (no less wise than They) were Besotted so long; or, that God for so vast a time, Owed so much ill will to Innumerable poor

What Sectaries are obliged to do if they Deny These Proofs.

Unproved Guesses no Proof.

Sectaries without proof censure the Roman Catholick Church, never censured by any Universal Church.

Two other most certain Truths.

An Unanswerable Difficulty proposed to Sectaries.

*They are to
prove, not by
Talk, but
sure Princi-
ples.*

*First, That
all the
Learned
Doctors of
the Roman
Catholick
Church,
were befor-
ed with
Fooleries
for ten
Ages.*

*Secondly,
That God
permitted
Innumera-
ble Chris-
tians to be
cheated for
so long a
time.*

*Thirdly,
That Pro-
testants have
Exactly
feiled
Christia-
nity Right
on its An-
cient Foun-
dations.*

*A fourth
Evidence
of Catho-
lick Reli-
gion drawn*

Christians, as not only to so them cheated and Mised; But more, utterly to withdraw his Providence, and suffer them to Grow under so lasting a Misery of Falshood; And this (which is ever to be Nored) whilst There was no Other Christian Society in the world to afford them true Instruction in the Pure Christian Faith. May it please Sectaries candidly, To clear this one Difficuly upon a Rational Principle, They will much Oblige me. This Don: Let Them also Vouchsafe to Add a Word more, for my Satisfaction: It is: If They Digest These Harsh Propositions: All those Doctors were Fooled: God Deserted his church for so long a time, That, They next come to a Solid Principle and Prove, That protestants among so many other Sectaries, were the Only Elect people appointed by Providence to Mend what They conceived Amisß in an old Decayed Church; And They must Show this Don without mixture of Errour in their Reformation, Yea, and without Danger of Marring more Then they went about to Mend. They tell us, of their setting Christianity Right Again on its Ancient Foundations, Here is place to make that Talk good, let us have a Strenuous Proof for it. If they say, they do it by Scripture; not one clear Text can be quoted without Twenty Glosses and Fancies added to it, And yet all will not Do. If again they will need's shake Hands with us, And say, We, and They, are all One and right in Fundamentals, It is an unproved Assertion: But, might it Pass; No Assurance can be given. That they have seiled all straights in Non-fundamentals. Se Disc. 3. C. 10. n. 2. and C. 9. n. 3. 2.

25. 4. Amongst the many other Evidences of our our Roman Catholick Religion, This is none of the least; That God, by special Providence, hath Preserved it both

in

Disc. IV. CI. To be the Roman Catholick. 419

in Being and Honor, for 16. whole Ages. This Church from Gods hath stood so long Invincible and Glorious in the heat of all Persecutions. *Special Providence.*

It Resisted the Violence of Jewes and Heathen Princes: It Encomured known Heresicks and Defeated them: No Counsel, or Wis of Man, nor Power of Devils have been hitherto Able to Dissolve it, whilst whole Kingdoms, and common-wealths lost their Ancient Glory, and were Subverted. Whence I Argue, as the Learned Gamaliel once did, Act. 5. 39. If this Counsel and work be of men, it will be Dissolved, But if it be of God, you (Sectaries who so vigorously Oppose it) cannot Dissolve it. Now here is

my Dilemma. Either this Church Subsisted for so vast a time by meer cheats and Humane Policy, or was, and is Protected by Gods special Providence. If the first be granted, It would have Perished long Ago, and come to nothing: And if God by Special Providence Preserved it in Being, It is Undubitably the Orthodox Church of Christ, And cannot be Argued of Disloyalty. To confirm this Truth, I ask.

Whether the Reasons now Alleged Prove True Christian Religion (taken under that General Notion) to have been preserved in so many Storms of Persecution by Gods special Assistance? If Sectaries Answer,

Yes; The very same Arguments applyed to the Roman Catholick Church, Prove that also Graciously upheld by Providence. The Reason is: Becaus, as I have

largely Proved, True Christian Religion (Though never so Generally taken) And the Roman Catholick Religion are Synonims, and the very Same, There is no Difference between Them. Now, if Sectaries say, That as well the Christian, as the Roman Catholick Religion, have subsisted so

long without special Assistance by Mans meer Industry, and Humane Policy, They do not only Enervate Old

A Convincing Argument.

Whatever Arguments Proves Christian Religion in General to have been preserved by God, Proves also the Roman Christian Religion Graciously preserved. The Reason.

420 Disc. IV. CII. *Protestancy proved Improbable.*

If Sectaries Say Religion hath been so long preserved by humane Policy, They vent an unproved Paradox. *Gambells Argument, But more, Vents a Paradox which can never be Proved, Or Brought to any known Principle, But to Fancy only.*

26. And thus much briefly of some Few Arguments for the Roman Catholick Religion, which if reduced to Form (And tis easy to do it) are *Vnanswerable*, You have more in the Treatise. Let us now be in the next place, what Sectaries can Say for their Novelties, or, upon what Proofs Antecedent to their Faith, They are able so far to Evidence the Credibility of *Protestancy*, As to make it, in a *Poor Measure*, *Probable*.

C H A P. II.

Protestancy is an Vnevidenced, And a most Improbable Religion; Or, rather no Religion, but a meer Fancied Opinion.

Protestancy as much Vnevidenced as Arianism. 1. **I**T is Vnevidenced, For, the Professors of it, can (by no Rational Arguments Previous to Belief) more Prove, That Their Owned Novelties ought to be Admitted of, as prudently *Credible*, Then the worst of Heresies, Take for an Instance, *Arianism*. Hear my reason. The very Grounds wheron Rational Proofs ought to stand, Fail them. *They have no Antiquity, no Univerſality, no Succession of Protestant Bishops and Pastors. They want lawful Mission, Miracles, and all other prudential Signs*

Disc IV. C. II. *Protestancy proved Improbable.* 421

Signs of Truth, as is largely Declared in the first Discours
c. 9. Yet from These and the like *Motives, Previous ra-*
tional Proofs manifesting the Credibility of Religion
must be Drawn, Or, The Religion which is Asserted
to be True, or Credible, will Appear Naked and Uneviden-
ced, having nothing to Uphold it, But the bare Word of Him,
who Says it is True, And Therefore is no Religion. I
need not to Urge this Point further, Becaus Sectaries
tacitly Suppose the Credibility of their Religion to be
Undemonstrable by outward Signs, and Marks of Truth. For,
Inquire of Them, Why They rather Embrace Pro-
testancy then Popery, or any other Doctrin of Here-
ticks? You never Hear a word of the long Continuance
of Their Church, of their lawful Mission, of the Succession
of Their Protestant Bishops from Christs time, Nor of Un-
doubted Miracles &c. No. But they presently run to
Scripture, and Tell you, That both their Faith and
the Motives of it (internal to the Book) Stand there
sufficiently Evidenced. Shall we see a little the Va-
nity of this Assertion?

*Rational
Motives
must Evi-
dence the
Credibility
of Religion,
or, 'tis up-
held by his
bare word
that says,
it is True.*

*Sectaries
seem to
make no
Account of
these Ante-
cedent Mo-
tives.*

2. Methinks, I enter into a Study where a learned
Protestant Sir's with a Bible before Him, And much
Dissatisfied with his Novelties; I Assure him, The
very want of *rational Proofs* Grounded on *Objective Mo-*
tives Drawes me from His Religion, which is neither
evidently, nor So much as Probably, made Credible
to Any. The man Points at his Bible, And saith;
This Book both Proves Protestant Religion, and Gives you Mo-
tives for it. Make, Sir, say I, this your Assertion
Good, *Viz.* The Bible Delivers Protestant Religion. He
Argues: The Bible Teaches that *Jesus is the Christ, the*
Eternal Son of God, the Redeemer of the World, And thus

*The Bible
Alone pro-
ves No-
thing for
Protestan-
cy.*

422 Disc. IV. C. II. *Protestancy proved Improbable.*

To prove
Doctrin by
Scripture
Common
to all Chri-
stians, is not
to prove
Protestan-
9.

much *Protestancy Teaches also.* *Ergo Scripture Proves Pro-*
testancy. I Answer: The Argument a *Genere ad speciem*,
Proves just nothing; For, *these Doctrins Common both to Ca-*
tholicks and other Sectaries, are no specificall Articles of prote-
stancy, as it is Reformed. Now, These, Sir, you
must Show Contained in Scripture. For Example: As
a Protestant, you Believe no Sacrifice Offered upon the
Altar, No Purgatory, No Transubstantiation, &c. Pray you
Warrant these Negative believed Articles by Scripture-proof.
He Replies: After his long Reading Scripture, He
Find's no Mention made at all of a Sacrifice, of Transub-
stantiation, And the like. I Answer: Others; as
learned as He, find Them, And Prove all by Scriptu-
re. Here, Therefore is no Owned Principle to Ground his
Denial on. But let this Pass.

3. I Argue against my Doctor. Though you find
not a Sacrifice, or Purgatory in Scripture, nay more;
Though, we falsely Suppose, both to be unrevealed
Mysteries, Yet, you cannot Positively say, by an Act
of faith: *A Sacrifice is not: Purgatory is not.* I prove it.
Nothing can be Believed by Divine Faith, But what
God Positively Reveal's: But God hath not said any
where Positively. *There is no Purgatory, no Sacrifice,*
no Transubstantiation; Ergo These Negatives cannot be
Believed by Divine Faith. Sectaries Grant the Major.
The Minor is as Evident, For They shall as soon Pro-
ve; That God now Positively Reveal's who shall be
the last man alive in the World, as Prove that Scri-
pture Positively Teaches, *Purgatory is not, a Sacrifice is*
not &c. Whence I Inferred: If Protestants Believe no
Purgatory (For Example) *It is not enough to say We Read*
of no such Place in Scripture; For (were this True) 'Tis is
only

Sectaries
Negative
way of
Arguing,
Demon-
strated
Proofes.

Disc. IV. CII. Protestantism proved Improbable. 423

Only a bare Negative, And at most Showes, That God hath Omitted to Speak at all of Purgatory, Which silence, can Ground no Act of Faith, Unless this Consequence be good. Because an infinite Verity, neither Affirms nor Denies That Third Place, Therefore I will Believe no Purgatory. To Believe then no Purgatory, or No Sacrifice, It is Necessary not only to Say, God saith nothing in Scripture of these Mysteries, But more is required, Viz. to Prove, That His infallible Revelation Positively Denies Them: For, Before I Positively Deny a Purgatory by my Faith, I must prove it Positively Denied by an Infinite Verity, Which is utterly Impossible. See this Point more amply Declared, Disc. 2. c. 8. n. 4. 5.

4. Perhaps the Doctor will Tell me. *These Negatives of No Sacrifice, No Purgatory, &c. Are no Essentials of Protestant Religion, But certain By-articles, which may as well be Rejected as maintained, whilst the Common, and All-over-ruled Doctrin of Christianity is firmly Believed.* If He Answer Thus: First, *Protestant Religion comes to Nothing; for all, or the most part of it is made up of these Negatives.* 2. *This Reformed Part is no Christian Religion: For, Christian Religion (at last Resolvable into Gods certain Revelation) cannot be Ycilded to, and Denied as men Pleas, Unless we grant, That, that may be Denied, which God saith is True.* 3. *It follows, Though a Protestant Curse, and Anathematize the specifical Articles of his Reformed Religion, as Reformed, He may yet be a good Protestant, and gain Salvation; by the General Faith Common to Arians and other Heretodox Christians.* I would gladly hear of a good Solution to these Difficulties, more largely laid Forth, Disc. 3. c. 11. n. 13. 14. In the mean while, you see, *How Unprovided a Thing Protestant Religion is,*

What Protestants are to prove, if They believ-
no any of
Their Ne-
gatives.

Before Sa-
crifices posi-
tively De-
ny Catho-
lick Do-
ctrin, They
are to pro-
ve, that
God hath
positively
Denied it
in his
Word.

If Sella-
ries make
Their Ne-
gatives no
Essentials to
Protestan-
cy, Their
Reformed
Religion is
no Chri-
stian Reli-
gion.

which

424 Disc. IV. CII. Protestantcy proved Improbable.

Protestan-
cy hath
Neither
Motives to
make it
Credible,
nor, a word
of Scripture
to make it
probable.

which hath Neither rational Motives to make it Credible, nor so much as one Favorable Word of Scripture to make it probable. You see moreover, How Scripture Alone without a Church, and a naked Church, not manifested by prudent Motives Leaves us in Darknes, Lead's into Labyrinths, Yea, And utterly Impossibilitat's no less the Search, Then the Finding out of true Religion.

From the
unevidence
of Prote-
stancy, the
improbabi-
lity of it
follows.

5. From the Evident Vnevidence of this new Religion, the Improbability of it follows as a Property doth to its Essence: For, an Unproved Religion, is Improbable, And, an Improbable Religion is no Christian Religion. Pray you Tell me: If one Pretend to be a Wise man, and never Gives Sign or Proof of his Wisdom; to be Learned, and shewes Himself a Dunce in all Company; to be Liberal, And Relieves none in Necessity; Will you Admit of all without Proof upon the bare Word of him, who Sayes, He is Wise, Learned, and Liberal? No, you will Slight such Talk as Vnworthy of Credit, and Hold it Improbable. This is the real Case of Protestants, who Vapour much, Talk much of the Truth of their Pure Reformed Gospel, But, When Things come to the Test, and Proofs are justly Called for to make Words good, They can neither Say, by force of any Received Principle, why They Believe Protestantcy in General to be Christs True Religion, Nor, why They give Assent by Divine Faith to so much, As to one Article within the compas of Protestantcy, as it is Reformed.

An Instan-
ce.

No Princi-
ples, wher-
by to prove
Protestan-
cy probable.

The Do-
ctrin Affir-
med, the
proofs of it,
The Oppo-
sition made
against
Catholicks
and the

6. You will Say this Charge goes High; And Therefore justly Require of me to Declare fursber, wherein Chiefly Our Adversaries Speak so Improbably? I Answer: They do it not in One Particular only, But in every Thing they Say. The Doctrin Asserted by them is Improbable: The Proofs of Their new Religion are Improbable. The Oppositi-
ma,

Disc. IV. C. II. *Protestancy proved Improbable.* 425

made against our Roman Catholick Faith, is Improbable: The Very Method Held in Arguing against us is improbable. Method Held in Arguing, improbable. All Fail's All is Deficient, And it Cannot be Otherwise: For, who is able to Perswade Himself without Assenting to a most Desperate Improbability, That in this Old age of the World, when all rather Expect the Day of Judgement Then a settlement of a new Religion, a Little Knot of men wholly Unknown a Hundred Years ago Should now Start up And Speak to the Purpose, when They go about not only to Cast Down a long Standing Church, But More, To make a Novelty Credible, Wherof the World had no Knowledge at all, For fifteen Ages Before? This I say is Highly Improbable But ad Rem,

7. I say First, Their Doctrin is Improbable, And Prove it. No Doctrin Fallibly Taught can be Ultimately Resolved into Gods Protestancy not resolvable into Gods Infallible Revelation; But, into Fallible Guesses Or Fancy On- Revelation, stand's on Fancy, and therefore ly: The professed Doctrin of Protestancy, as Reformed, is Fallibly Taught, And cannot be Resolved into Gods infallible Revelation; Therefore, it Finally Resteth on meer Guesses or Fancy, And Consequently is Improbable. Se Disc. 1. c. 1. n. 6.

8. 2. It is Improbable to say; That Scripture Alone, without an Infallible Interpreter makes any man Certain in what he Glosses, or at all Infallible; For both Arians, And Pelagians Read it, and Gloss it Yet Err Grossly in Points most Essential. Protestants Glosses, as improbable as the Arians. Protestants, who Own No infallible Interpreter, both Read and Gloss as These Do by their own uncertain Guesses, And therefore Gloss as Improbably. Disc. 1. c. 4. n. 7. 8.

9. 3. A Doctrin which at its first Rise And after Also, was, and is still as much Opposed by Other Christians the whole World over, As Ever Arianism was, and is Improbable. Universal Opposition makes Protestancy improbable. Protestancy Had, and hath still This Universal Opposition

Hhh

made

416. Disc. IV. C. II. Protestantcy proved Improbable.

made against it, And therefore upon that sole Account is Improbable. Disc. 1. c. 6. n. 3.

Protestan-
cy Disho-
nor Christ,
and there-
fore is im-
probable.

10. 4. To Say on the one side That Protestantcy is the true Orthodox Religion; And, on the other to Grant, That the Roman Catholick Church (which Sectaries Condemn of Error) Hath Infinitely Obscured Protestantcy with the Splendor of most Glorious Marks of Truth manifestly known to the World, as Miracles, Conversions &c. is Highly Improbable, Becaus Dishonorable to Christ and Injurious to God, who cannot make a Fals Religion more clear to Reason or more Prudently Credible then his own Truths and Verities are. Disc. 1. c. 12.

A new
coyned
Heresy may
be better
Defended
then Protes-
tancy.

n. 1. 2.

11. 5. A new Coyned Heresy without Motives of Credibility may as well be Invented and better Defended by the bare Words of Scripture, Then Protestantcy Can be Defended. But such an Heresy is Improbable; Therefore Protestantcy upon that Account is Much more Improbable. Disc. 1. c. 12.

Sectaries
improbably
allow God
no more
but a La-
me and
half Pro-
vidence.

n. 3. 4. 5.

12. 6. To say, That God had only care of a Bible, and Preserved that free from Corruption, But withall, Permitted His own Immaculate Spouse the Church (which He Founded Pure) To play the Harlot; And afterward to Deceive Christians with Damnable Errours; Is not only to allow him a Lame and Half Providence, But also to Vent a Doctrin more then improbable (That is) Enormously Impious. Sectaries say so, And therefore Speak improbably. Disc. 2. c. 2. n. 7.

They must
say that a
Church
essentially
errable
may as ea-
sily lose the
Consolation
of Grace as
Truth.
Both are
improbable.

13. 7. A Church essentially Errable may lose All Truth, And consequently as easily All Consolation of Grace, And so Become wholly Divorced from Christ: The first Protestants Assert And Therefore must maintain the Other, Which is Heretical, And more then Improbable Doctrin. Disc. 2. c. 6. n. 7. 8.

14. 8.

Disc. IV. C. II. Protestancy proved Improbable. 427

14. 8. Though contrary to both Truth and Conscience it were Supposed, That We Prove not our Catholick Verities, Yet no Absolute Denial of these Verities follows from our not Proving Them: But Protestants upon this False supposed Negative, We Prove Not, without the least Appearance of any infallible Revelation for their Ground their Faith, Which is a most Desperate Improbability, Disc. 2. c. 8. n. 2. 3.

15. 9. It is Improbable to Say, That Protestants, whilst they Teach their Novelties or Interpret Scripture, Do either the One, or Other as Faithful Oracles or Instruments Assisted by the Holy Ghost: For These men, whether They Teach or Interpret Profess Themselves Fallible in All They Say; Therefore are not assisted Instruments of this Blessed Spirit who Teaches by none The Necessary Doctrine of a Universal Church, Interpret's by None but such as do it Infallibly. Disc. 2. c. 9. n. 8.

16. 10. To say, That that Article of our Creed: I Believe the Holy Catholick Church, was not True in all Ages before Luther, is more Then Improbable. Protestants, who can name no other Catholick Church, but the Roman, which They Hold Erroneous, must both Vow and Vow the Creed False for so vast a time. Disc. 3. c. 1. n. 1.

17. 11. It is highly improbable to Say, That either the true Church of Christ can be corrupted in Doctrine, or, that a Doctrine common to All Hereticks is enough for Saving Faith. Protestants Affirm both. Disc. 3. c. 2.

18. 12. A Church Essentially Hypocritical That may Believe One thing And must Profess an other, is unworthy of Credit, and cannot be judged to Hold probable Doctrine. Protestants own such a Church. Disc. 3. c. 6. n. 10.

19. 13. A Church, or Religion, that hath not one Article

Hhh 2

They Improbably found their Doctrine upon False supposed Negatives. Being fallible, and therefore not Assisted by the Holy Ghost. They pretend Improbably to Teach Christs Doctrine with Certainty.

They make Improbably an Article of our Creed False.

To Teach that a Doctrine common to Hereticks is enough for Salvation, is Improbable. A Religion essentially Hypocritical, Improbable.

So is a Church
without a
word of
Scripture
for it.
Another
Improbabi-
lity of Se-
ctaries

428. Disc. IV. C. II. Protestantism proved Improbable.

Article of Faith Grounded on Scripture (as it is Reformed) yet Pretend's to Draw all to it By Force of Scripture, Delivers most improbable Doctrin, Protestantism is such a Religion. Ibidem n. 11.

20. 14. Protestants that Pretend to submit to the Authority of one, two or three of the Ancient Fathers, And Scornfully Reject the Authority of the Roman Church, proceed Improbably. Disc. 3. c. 7. n. 9. And thus much Briefly of a few Doctrinal Improbabilities Taught by Protestants, The Treatise afford's you more, Touching the Liberty, The Unconstancy, The Endles Dissensions of Sectaries, with other sad Effects that follow This new Gospel. These I wave in this place. And

Sectaries
Proofs of
their own
Religion
are Improbable.
The Reason.

21. Say 2. The proofs of Sectaries for Their new Religion are Improbable. The Assertion is consequential, and Stand's Firm, Upon what is said already, For a Doctrin Proved Improbable by undoubted Principles cannot be made Evidently Credible by any rational Arguments, Vales Truth be contrary to Truth: But, The Doctrin of Protestantism is Demonstrated Improbable; Therefore no Rational Proofs can make it Evidently credible; nor so much as weakly Probable. To confirm this. Do no More, but Demand of any Sectary (the Question hath been often Proposed) Upon what Rational Proof or received Principle Antecedent to his Faith, He Believes Protestantism (I do not say Christian Religion) taken in what General way you will To be the Best and Purest Religion, now Professed? He cannot Pretend that this Novelty is ex Terminus Evidently True, or Credible (for no Religion is so) Much less, That He Believes without Reason, or, Because He will Believe; Therefore after he hath Declared what He Believes, He must also Satisfy the Doubt, And Tell us. Why He

A Protestant cannot say upon a rational Principle why He judges his Religion true or the best of all others.

Disc. IV. C. II. Protestantism proved Improbable. 419

He Believes And, Ground his Answer upon a Rational Principle. But it is as impossible to Satisfy This one Demand, as to Remove the Pyrenean Mountains from the place they Stand in. The Reason is. It is Highly Against all Reason to Embrace any Religion, whether new or old without Rational Proofs Grounded on sure Motives, which Plead as it were in Gods behalf and make Religion Evidently Credible Before we Yeild Assent to it. But, Protestants have no rational Motives Antecedent to their Belief of Protestantism, which Hold a strict Analogy with Those of Christ and his Apostles, as is Amply Proved Disc. 1. c. 9. 10. 11. 12. therefore their Religion, as Protestantism, is without Proof Vindicated. If they can Gainsay my Assertion let them Speak, And Bring their Motives to Light. We would gladly hear what can be Answered plainly to this one plain Demand:

It is highly
Against
Reason to
Embrace a
Religion
without
Prudent
Motives.
Protestantism
has no
Prudent
Motives.
If they have
any in
store They
can be laid
forth to
Reason.

22. After a General View Taken of Protestantism, We may Descend to Particulars, and enquire in the next Place Why the Professors of it Believe so much as one Article of this Novelty? For example: Two Sacraments only, no Sacrifice, no Church Infallible. Why They Believe (And 'Tis the Worst of all, 'Yea, and a Paradox beyond Expression.) That Christ Abandoned the very Church he Founded in the greatest Need and Danger that can concern a Church, Which was and is to Defend it from Heresy. Here we may justly stand astonished and Ask, How it came to Pass that our Careful Lord Jesus, (like one Drowsy, or Forgetful of his Charge) Withdrew his Providence From that Church He Founded? What? Hath He been asleep so long? 'Tis True, when He Entered a little Boat, Matt. 8. (It was a Type of the Church) a great Tempest arising, He seemed regardless of his Disciples fears. And Slept a

A strange
Paradox of
Protestants.

430 Disc. IV. CII. *Protestancy proved Improbable.*

Christ *while; But to Say, He hath now Slept on For a Thousand*
founded the **Years, and like one Riches, Suffered that Arke He Buils not**
Roman **only to be Tossed with the worst of Tempests, But to be over-**
Catholic **turned with a Deluge of Errours and Fals Doctrin, is a No-**
Church, yet **velty sister for Protestants to Broach then Any Christian in the**
Protestants **World to Hear or Think of. Ask therefore what scripture,**
say, he suf- **what Vnanimous Consent of Fathers, or Councils, have They**
fered it to **for this long Supposed Negligence of our Vigilant Lord? I'll**
perish, **tell you. They can Allege just so much proof for this Vnheard**
of Paradox as They Do For Their other Novelties, which is
Protestancy **purely Nothing. Protestancy therefore, whether we consider**
Every way **is in a General Way, or Descend to the particular Tenents**
unproved, **Therof is meerly Fancy, An Vnproved and Consequently,**
An Improbable Religion.

Sectaries *23. And Hence it is (Mark it, you will find what I say*
Thoughtles **most True.) That Sectaries chiefly Busy Themselves in find-**
of Proving **ing Fault and Carping at Catholick Religion (As if, Forsooth,**
Protestan- **Theirs were made good Becaus They Caviel at Ours) But think**
cy, make it **not of An Other Task, which most of all Concern's Them, And**
Their chief **'Tis Positively to Prove, That Protestancy ought to be Owed**
work to ca- **as Christ's only True and Orthodox Religion, This they wholly**
will as our **wave, and the Reason is, Becaus an Improbability cannot be**
Religion. **Proved.**

Protestants *24. Pray you Tell me. Did you ever yet Hear*
prove not **from Protestant Any Thing like a convincing Princi-**
their own **ple, when He goes about to Prove two Sacraments and no mo-**
Religion, **re, or, That Faith only justifies without Charity? Or (to**
be brief) That Protestancy ought to be Valued of as the on-
ly pure and Orthodox Religion of Christianity? No. I ha-
ve Perused some of Their Authors, and find These and
Their other Novelties, either passed over in silence, or,
so slightly Handled, That they seem afraid to med-
dle

Disc. IV. C. II. *Protestancy proved Improbable.* 431

dle with such Difficulties. What do They Therefore? *Their whole strain is to find fault. This, in our Religion is not Right. That's not well proved. A Third Thing Pleaseth not. Here we have a Novelty introduced. There is a Ceremony blamable &c. Then a leer follows in Handsom Language. And Their Work is Don. In the mean time, The Main point in Controversy (which is to Prove by undeniable Grounds Their Right settlement in Faith without Novelty) is no more touched on. Then if it were not in Being.*

But I think it enough to Cautel at ours.

25. In case they Reply. To prove our Religion Fals, *An inconsequence of Sequaries.* in some particulars is sufficient to prove theirs True in all. I have Answered, could this be don, The Inference is yet wors then Non-sense: For suppose, *An Arian Did Convince Protestants of much Falsity, Doth it Therefore follow that all he says, is true? No.* What then doth the Protestant speak here to the Purpose? 2. It is more then Improbable to prove any one Doctrin of the Roman Catholick Religion Fals. The Reason I give in this place (to omit Others) is, *Because an undubitable Principle which cannot be shaken, Stand's Firmly against These supposed Proofs, And is thus Hinted at Already. Christ Jesus Founded a Catholick Church which should never Fail, and Therefore could never be deserted by him. For, No Monarch that layes the Foundations of a Kingdom and obliges himself to take care of it, can without injustice Abandon it, unles a Contrary power, or great Negligence Deprive him of his Rights. Now, none can be more powerful then Christ, And I hope our Adversaries will not make him Guilty of Negligence or Injustice. Therefore He still Defends the Militant Church (a most Dear Kingdom) which he Established. Perhaps some less Considerate will say. We here Tacitly*

It is impossible to prove the Roman Catholick Doctrin Fals.

The Reason

Disc. IV. C. II. *Protestancy proved Improbable.* 433

on their Side, They should silence us with undeniable Proofs drawn from Scripture, from Councils and the Unanimous Consent of Fathers. They should shew us Precisely, When our Errors first Began, wherof they talk but Prove Nothing. They should plainly Point out That Orthodox and Universal Church, which as Strenuously Defended pure Protestancy six Hundred Years ago, As We now, and the rest of the world do Oppose it. They should also tell us, what Orthodox Church six or seven Ages since (There was then most surely a True Church in the World) Condemned Those very Doctrins of our Church that Sectaries now Condemn and Cavil at. Such Arguments, could they be Heard of, were to the Purpose; But, To have nothing from these Brisk Antagonists but Trifles And meer slight stuff, is Lamentable. Now we are Told Scripture may be Interpreted this way, now an Other. Now, our Modern Authors say This, now That. Now Council seem's to Contradict Council. Now meer Patches, and Fragments of Fathers, Pittifully Abused and Weighed out of their Circumstances, are Produced against us. Now they leer at our Popes, now at our Prelates, Now at our Ceremonies, And Thus They Hold on in a slighter Way of skirmishing Unable, 'God knows, to do more Against a Church which Divine Providence Uphold's, And therefore It Hath not only withstood Harder Shocks from former Heresicks (Then now are in Being) But also Defeated them. So it is. *Ecclesia in victa res est* &c. This Ancient Church is, And will be conquerant, Though Hell and Heresy Band against it.

Their way of Arguing, insipid and weightles, The Roman Catholick Church hath withstood stronger Heresicks then Protestants are.

C H A P. III.

*A Word more of Sectaries new Mode
of Arguing best Layd Forth, By
Touching briefly on one Con-
tro-versy.*

*Faults of
Sectaries.*

1. **W**Hat I would say now of this Subject, As also of the just Exceptions one might make against our Sectaries writing Controversies, Cannot be Expressed in few words: Their Faults and Failings being as they are, no less numerous then looking different wayes at once. In a word: Besides Their Corruptions, and self-concepted Glosses wherof there is no end, you have first Gross Mistakes. 2. Pretty Peevish jeers (harmles things) for they hurt no body, and give the Printer work. 3. No little ignorance. 4. Meer Suppositions for Proofs. 5. Much unsincere Dealing, when They slightly handle Controversies and slyly dissemble such Proofs, as make for our Catholick Verities. The last Defect (but this is both remediles, and Transcendent) They never bring Assertions to Principles, nor give us weight for weight, I mean Authority Answerable to our Authorities in any one debated Question.

Mr. Stillingfleet.

2. These faults, and many more I have Discoved in a short Chapter of a late Writer, *part. 3. chap. 6. pag.*

pag. 638. Where he treat's of Purgatory. The shortness made me read it ; for where you have length and little substance with it, one is soon wearied. To be brief therfore.

3. Our Adversary in that 6. Chapter, were he would say something of the sense of Fathers Concerning Purgatory, first Begin's with his *Jeers*, and call's Purgatory the great *Diana* of our Church. And why *Diana* pray you? What has that *Dea Sytrorum*, or Hunting-Goddes to do with Purgatory, or Purgatory with Her? Well, but this *Diana*, He sayes, besides *casualities* and *Deodands*, brings great Revenues into the Church, in so much that she's *grown fat* by the firs of the People, And (which Kill's all) *Spalatensis* (whose Authority is as good as Luthers) Confirms the Doctrin. Is not this think ye a piece of Profound Divinity, with the rest that follows of *Hell's Suburbs*, and bidding Adieu to *Indulgences* and *years of Indulgy*? But, 'Tis enough : you se how little the jest is worth, I leave it. Surely, You'll have him more in earnest now.

4. He tell's us therfore, After his quoting the Council of Trent, that the *Guilt* of Mortal sin being remitted by the merits of *christ*, The *Punishment* is supposed still to remain. Here is either a Mistake, ignorance, or both. For, All know, when the guilt of a mortal Sin is remitted, which is an *exigency* or an *intrinsic* condignity to Eternal punishment, *that punishment*, *eo ipso*, is remitted with the guilt, unles you say, that God can punish a sin which is not, and this for ever. It is true, an exchange from the eternal, to a temporal punishment is made by Almighty God through the merits of *christ iesus*, when the due means prescribed for

lii. 2.

Remis-

*Jeers begin
the work.*

*The jest is
ended.*

*Mistakes
follow.*

*God cannot
de potentia
ordinaria
punish a
sin eternal.
by which is
not, and so
me deny it
possible de
potentia
absoluta.*

436 Disc. IV. CIII. Exceptions Against Sectaries

Remission is used by the Penitent, And this temporal punishment is to be satisfied For here, or in Purgatory.

Mistakes,
in Stating
the Que-
stion.

5. He states next the Controversy between the Greeks and Latin Church upon this subject, and saith, *The main thing objected by the Greeks against the Latins was this temporary punishment for sin in a future state.* Sir, I must now Ipeak to you, and say your Assertion is an unproved supposition, And very untrue as will presently appear. Neither doth the Apology you so blindly quote *Ed. Salm.* so much as Probably favour it. Mark your own Translation. We own no *Purgatory fire*, nor any temporal punishment *by fire*. The contest therefore was not concerning a temporal punishment precisely Considered, For The Greek Church never denied a punishment, but about the particular *Pain by fire*, And this purgation by fire, some of them perhaps

Obscurity.

No man
here
knows
what *Ed.*
Salm.
signifies.

might think (though most weakly) slackned the endeavours of the Diligent, if your quotation be true, for I wonder why you run to *Ed. Salm.* when you have at hand the Parisian, the Venetian, the Cullen Editions, with others. Now, that which I Assert is without Dispute most certain, as Appears by the *very Definition* of the Council of Florence under *Eugenius* the Fourth, where the Greeks with their Emperour, and Patriarch of Constantinople met, and Consenting to the Latins Defined thus. *Item definimus si ve-*

The Coun-
cils Defi-
nition,

re Penitentes in Dei charitate decesserint &c. Also we Define, if those who are truly Penitent and depart this life in the love of God, and yet have omitted the worthy fruits of penance for their sins committed, *eorum animas penitus Purgatoris purgari*, that such soules are pur-

purged by the pains of Purgatory. Thus much you might have read in *Alfonfus à Castro*, whom you cite lib. 12. Tit. Purgat. at the end of the Title. And therfore when *Alfonfus* at the Beginning therof, attributes the Denial of Purgatory to the Greeks, He must either mean (if he contradict not himself) that some

Alfonfus à Castro explained.

of them only denyed it, or that most denyed a place of torment by Fire: For, How can He say, that the Greeks Denyed all future punishment in Purgatory, when He expressly Grants they Defined the contrary: Nay, He saith more, that the Greeks then assembled in that Council, published a book *Ad probandum Purgatorij locum* to prove the place of Purgatory, which book was printed at Basil both in Greek and Latin. And here by the way you may Observe another fraud of Sectaries, who if they find a piece of a sentence seemingly favorable for them, that's layd hold on, and whatever clear's the Expression or makes against their mistaking it, That's waved and dissembled. But let us go on. You Oppose against the Councils Definition *Marcus Eugenius* utterly refusing to subscribe it.

Dissembling of Difficulties proper to Sectaries.

What is it to the purpose whether He did or no? Was his sole vote Enough to unvote, or make null the sentiment of a whole Council? O, say you, He would never have don so, Had all the Controversy been whether the Fire was real or Metaphorical. How know you that but by your proofles Guesles only? Besides, that was not the Controversy.

The authority of Marcus Eugenius weighles.

6. You still go on a Gueffing. The Greeks indeed, say you, Do not Believe that any Souls enjoy the Beatificall vision before the Day of Iudgement, And on that account they Allow of prayer for the Dead, not with any respect

438 Disc. IV. CIII. Exceptions Against Sectaries

More Mi-
stakes and
Errors,

to a Deliverance of Souls out of Purgatory, but to the partici-
pation of their happines at the great Day. Answer.

You have here as many foul mistakes and Errours as
there are words. And, First tell me, who Those
Greeks were that Denied souls the Beatifical Vision
before the Day of Judgement? Your Indefinite Pro-
position, *The Greeks do not Believe* &c, Seem's to include
all, And this you must intend, if you speak to the pur-
pose; for to say, that some few, here and there, we-
re of that Opinion is no Advantage to your Cause.

A few of
that Opi-
nion is no
Advanta-
ge.

Leo Alatus
a most
Learned
Author.

Now to shew you how untrue this part of your Asser-
tion is, as also the rest that followes; withall, to con-
firm what is alleged out of the Council of Florence,
I'll give you the Testimony of a most Erudite Author
Leo Alatus a Græcian born, and one better versed in
the knowledge of the Greek Church, then we Islanders
can be, so remote from it. Sir, Believe it, had you
red one only book of this Author (I'll now quote it)
to say nothing of his other works, Chiefly *Contra Hottin-
gerum*, you would never have writ this 6. Chapter a-
gainst Purgatory; For, He doth not only ridd out of
the way those vulgar Objections you Propose (not o-
ne I am sure is omitted) but also acquit's himself of
far Greater, And, (as behoves a Scholler) so strong-
ly maintains our Catholick Verity by undeniable Prin-
ciples, that none shall Hereafter speak probably again
it.

7. To the matter therefore now in hand, *Leo Alatus*
in his Book entituled: *De utriusque Ecclesia Occidentalis &
Orientalis perpetua in Dogmate de Purgatorio, Consensione*
Printed at Rome Anno 1655. and Dedicated to Pope
Alexander the VII. page 243. n. 34. which begin's, *Hic*

vero

verò paululum immorandum, Declares out of the Acts of the Council of Florence what the Greeks thought of *Purgatory fire*, what perswasion they were wrought into after much Dispute had with the Latins, And finally with what judgement they returned into Greece. *Cum Ferrara* (saith He) *adhuç Synodus esset* &c. when the Synod was yet at Ferrara the 4. of June, The Question of *Purgatory fire*, was propounded. The Latins shewed first, that such soules as have venial Sins are purged by a *Purgatory fire*, receive help, And are freed from those pains by the prayers of Priests, by the Sacrifice of the Mass, Almes-giving, and other pious works. 2. That the soules of Saints are in Heaven present to the blessed Trinity, and there enjoy all Happines. Therefore They distinguished three different places. *Of the just in Heaven, of the Damned in Hell, and of a third sort, suffering in Purgatory till all be satisfied for.* The Greeks, saith *Alatus*, Hearing what was alleged by the Latins out of the Holy Scripture and Fathers, said they would return an Answer to every particular. Therefore on the 14. of June, *Bessario* the Nicene, Metropolitan gave in writing the Greeks Opinion; and expounded that Passage of the Apostle contrary to the sentiment of the Latins, yet, Confessed, *The Greeks held a temporal punishment, due to souls not perfectly purged*, And, that these go in *locum tenebrososum, locum mæroris*, into a dark place of Grief, of Sorrow, and Pain, yea, and are freed from that torment by the Sacrifices of Priests and Charitable Alms deeds, But, still, He said the torment *is not by fire*. The Difference therefore between the Greeks and Latins was, that those Confess a place of *Pain* and Sorrow, *sed non per ignem*,

The Dispute Concerning Purgatory fire between the Greeks and the Latins.

What the Latins Answered.

What the Greeks Answered.

The Greeks acknowledged a place of punishment though not by fire.

440 Disc. IV. CIII. Exceptions Against Sectaries

ignem, not by fire: The Latins contrary stood for a Purgatory by Fire. All this passed before the Definition of the Council, And therefore you se how untrue your Assertion, is *viz. That the Greeks Allow not of prayer for the Dead with any respect to a Deliverance of souls out of Purgatory pains*; For, here the contrary is professed by them.

More Mistakes concerning the Greeks.

The Opinion of some is not the Judgement of a whole Church.

The Greeks granted the beatificall vision to souls before the day of Judgement.

The last Decision of Both Dissiculties.

Again, whereas you say, *the Greeks believe not, that any souls enjoy the beatificall vision in Heaven before the Day of Judgement*, Alas! *page 245. fine*, plainly contradicts you, Affirming, that the *Greek Church* believes the contrary; Although He Adds, *nonnullus esse* There are some of that Opinion, but the voice of *some few*, I hope, gives us not the sentiment of their whole Church. At last, saith my Author, *page 246.* After much contention and Delay made by the Greeks a whole day long from morning till Six at night, They met again the 27. of Iulij, and debates being ended, *Fixmarunt*, they established this Truth. *Sanctorum animas, ut animas, ad perfectam pervenisse beatitudinem, in resurrectione tamen perfectiorem consecuturas, cum propriis corporibus fulgebunt ut Sol &c.* That the Souls of Saints come to perfect happines, yet in the Resurrection they are to enjoy a more perfect felicity because of their bodies, when these shall shine like the Sun &c. Finally, in the 25. and last Session, Three things were concluded. The first, that the souls of Saints are perfectly happy *quoad Animas*. The second: Souls of great sinners are Endlessly miserable. Now for the third state of souls, which they called *Medias*, They voted, such to be in a place of Torment, but contended not, whether it was fire, Darknes, or any like grievous torment, and These They said (after a perfect purgation)

tion) were to enter in the Society of the Blessed, and so the very essence of God, *sine ullo medio*, that is, immediatly. To confirm both these Verities He produceth the last profession of Faith which *Ioseph* the Patriarch of Constantinople made of this subject in these Few, but pithy words. *ὁμολογῶ τῶν ψυχῶν τὸ καθαγέτιον.* I confels a Purgatory of souls. And He Added, that the Greek and Latin Church were not Devided upon any account of Purgatory. Finally, page 249. *Alatius* recounts with what judgement the Greeks returned concerning Purgatory, which appears, saith He, by their Rituals. It was, *that souls not perfectly cleansed, are purged in a place of Tormens; and receive benefis by the prayers of the living, as is now Declared.*

The Profession of Faith made by the Patriarch of Constantinople.

With what judgement the Greeks returned Home.

8. It would be a long work, to prosecute All that our Learned Author hath of this Subject. Whoever desires more, may read him chiefly from the first page to the 42. where He shewes first the mistakes of some Writers, that thought the Greeks absolutely Denied Purgatory, And with these, Sir, you may ranck your unquoted Authors, pag. 640. But *Alatius* Disfrank's them all, Declares the ground of their Errour, And shewes how they were deceived by the *vvritings* of some *Schismatical Gracians*, whose Authority, saith He, Avail's as little to prove that the Greek Church Denied Purgatory, As if one should now cite *Luther*, *Calvin*, or *Ochinus*, and believe them, when they go about to recount the supposed Errours of the Roman Church. *Stulte enim argumentaremur* (They are his words page 3.) The man would Discours foolishly, that should conclude, the Greek Church Held no place of Purgatory, Because *Marcus Ephesius*, *Barlaam Monachus*, *Nilus Thessalonicensis*, *Iosephus*

How some Latins were beguiled that say, the Greeks absolutely Deny Purgatory.

K k k

Bryen-

442 Disc. IV. C. III. Exceptions Against Sectaries

The Er-
rours of
some, are
not to be
imputed to
a whole
Church.

Bizantius
adversus
Principem
Armenio-
rum,

Three
Truths
established
by Manuel
Caleca.

Bryennius, And other Schismatics have falsely related mat-
ters so, which way of Arguing is as weak, as if one
should say, That, that whole Church is now infected
with *Arianism*, *Macedonianism*, *Eutychianism*, or *Nestorian-
ism*, Because some among them Profess these Heresies.
Alas, The Errours of some that receded from that Church
as *Nicetas Byzantius* cited page. 4. well observes, cannot
in Justice be imputed to their whole Church, which ever
defended a place of Purgatory, And therefore He Tell's the
Chief of the Armenians of his unhandsom Plea, when
He pretended, that the Church left the *Schismatical O-
pinion* of some few. No such matter, saith. *Nicetas*,
οὐδὲ μᾶλλον τὰ ληθῆς ἐπείν, ὑμᾶς ἀξήμυν. But the contrary is
true, 'tis you the far less number, that deserted us. Page
the 12. *Alatins* cites *Manuel Caleca* lib. 4. *adversus Græcos*,
who doth not only Admit of a place of Purgatory for
Souls not perfectly Cleanfed, but moreover Deliver's
these three particular Truths according to the Sentiment
of that Church. The first. *It is not Necessary to pray
for those who now enjoy Beatitudo*, For although, saith He,
we offer Sacrifice for the Saints, it is not don that
they may Obtain mercy Having it already, *But it is
offered up for this End, that by Honoring Saints we may
make them, through the mercy of God, to be Mediators
for us.* The second Verity is. *The Church never Prayes
for the Damned.* The last. There is therefore a third
place of Punishment called Purgatory, where souls,
not perfectly Cleanfed, must by the just judgement of
God, suffer for less Offences, and so pass into glory.
This learned Author has much more to this Purpose,
But, it is impossible to touch on all.

9. Let us return to *Alatins*, that in every page re-
futes

futes your Doctrin. Page 74. He Tell's us, that the whole Greek Church, taught by Apostolical Tradition, ever prayed for the departed who were neither cast in to Hell, nor are Glorious in Heaven. And He proves this even by the Confession of innumerable that are of the Schism, Here he gives us the judgement of *Gabriel Severus Philadelphienfis* in the book He writ against the Latins of Purgatory, where He shewes how far the Greek Church agrees with the Latin, and wherein it Differs. *We Agree*, saith He, *that souls piously departed this life receive ωφέλιαν καὶ ἀνάσιν, benefits and relaxation* in those places they are, and this, by the Alms-deeds and good prayers of others, as *Dionysius Areopagita* teaches. And besides *Dionysius*, *Severus* Alleges also the Testimonies of *S. Athanasius*, *S. Chrysostom*, *Basil* and *Theophilact* for this great Verity, that such souls departed have help, comfort, and relaxation by the Sacrifice of the Mass, by Alms, and pious Prayer of the Living. Thus a Grecian Schismatick speak's. And it is not He Alone that produceth these Fathers for a proof of Purgatory, but other Greek Authors also, even those of the Schism, as *Alatus* Demonstrat's in several places. And most surely, so unanimous a Consent of many (which whom the Latins agree also) cannot but make the sense of these Fathers indubitable For our Catholick Verity.

The whole Greek Church taught by Apostolical Tradition, prayed for Souls in Purgatory.

Those of the Schism Confess it.

The Interpretation of the Greek and Latin Church make the sense of

Fathers clear for Purgatory.

10. Now, Sir, if other Adversaries say as you Do, *that the Greeks indeed Prayed for the Dead, but without any respect of Delivering souls out of Purgatory, or a place of torment*, Turn once more to *Alatus* page 87. where He gives you not only one, or two witnesses, But, as He speak's, *Universam ipsam Graciam*, The Testimony of

444 Disc. IV. C. III. Exceptions Against Sectaries

A clear refutation of our Adversaries. the whole Greek Church, *palam & aperte*, openly Avowing these torments of Purgatory, And, to this Purpose He quotes their Rituals, their Office of the Dead, and other Prayers. In the Office you have

this *Orison*. Μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἀνάπαυσον χεῖρὲς τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς δούλου σου &c. *O Christ give rest with thy Saints to the soul*

of thy servant, ἡ λύπη ἡ στενωπὸς, where grief, sadness, and Mourning may cease, give them a life of perpetual happiness &c. Another Prayer is. Αὐτὸς Κύριε

Dead, significant for Purgatory. ἀνάπαυσον &c. Our Lord Himself, Give rest to your Servant, N, in a place of refreshment, from whence grief, misery, and deep sighing may pass. This is also repeated in their *Paracletica*. From Tears and bitter Crying out,

Deliver, O Saviour, thy servants. Again they beg they may be freed from all punishment; from a Prison of Sufferance, and soon be settled in a place of joy, where the just inhabit with perfect forgiveness of all their transgressions. Yet more. *Alatus* page 93. Saith, This is the Doctrin of S. Dionysius, of the great S. Basil

Præcatione 3. in Pentecosten, where He prays, that these souls may not only be quit of Torments and sufferances, but moreover, be placed in the Tabernacles of the just, and enjoy happiness for ever. Finally, page 95. He quotes S. Cyril of Hierusalem *Catech. Mystag.* 5. who doth not

only acknowledge Assistance afforded the Dead by our Prayers (for such an Assertion is easily misinterpreted) But, besides Affirms, They receive remission and relaxation of their punishment. The like Severus Philadelphienfis,

though a Schismatick, Confesseth That the Greek Priests pray every Saturday, that, these departed Souls may find God Merciful, gain remission of their sins, and be freed from the punishment, which torments them.

Some Fathers quoted by Alatus.

The Confession of a Schismatick.

11. I am forced to wave a world of other Testimonies most pertinently produced by this learned Author for our Catholick Verity. Page 56. He shoves, that as well the Ancient as Modern Greeks acknowledge the continued practise of praying for the Dead to have come from the Apostles, And in confirmation of it cites *Gennadius* the Patriarch; *S. Chrysostom Hom. 69. ad populum* expressly Approving the Doctrin, who also saith much help is afforded the Dead by Prayer. This is again confirmed pag. 63. by the Ancient Testimony of *S. Dionysius* (*sive quis alius*) *Ecclesiast. Hier. c. 3.* by Holy *Ephrems* last will and Testament, and others. Page 93. and 94. He proves more amply that these Prayers were made for a Delivery of souls from pain, from Grief, Mourning, Affliction, and Torment, as is now declared. Page 104. He shoves, the sufferance of these Departed in Purgatory not to be a slight *Kάλασις*, as some Sectaries would have it, but a hideous *penal torment*, true, real, and not Imaginary. And to this purpose *Nicolaus Cabasila in Exposit. Missæ cap. 45.* and *Ioannes Engenicus* are quoted page 147. and 149. The first Affirm's: Souls are purged and receive remission of Their sins by the Prayers of Priests, The other: The whole Greek Church acknowledgeth this Purgation of souls after Death, and that releasment of their sufferance is obtained by the Sacrifice of the Mass, by pious Prayer, and other good works acceptable to God. *Alatus* therefore most justly deplores the pertinacy of some, who read so often *Κάθαρσιν*, and *Καθαρισμὸν* in Greek Authors, and yet causlessly doubt of Purgatory. *Rem habent, & do nomine contendunt*, They have the Thing and yet boggle at the Name. Confess

Prayer for the Dead an Apostolical Tradition.

The pain of Purgatory is really great, not slight, or imaginary.

The Thing granted, 'Tis Senseless to strive about the name.

446 Disc. IV. C. III. Exceptions Against Sectaries

then, saith He, which is undeniable, that souls have relief in a place of punishment by the Prayers of the faithful, And call it Purgatory, or what els you please, it imports nothing.

12. Sir, by these Testimonies alone (besides innumerable others omitted) which none can either except against, or, probably explicate, you se, how wide both parts of your Assertion are from Truth. The

*Both parts
of our Ad-
versaries
Assertion
proved un-
true.*

one is. *The Greeks do not believe* (you must mean the Greek Church) *any souls to enjoy the beatifical vision before the Day of judgement, which is now proved absolutely untrue.* The other. *They allow indeed of prayer for the Dead, but with-
out any respect to a Deliverance of Souls out of a place of pun-
ishment:* And this second, if there be a latitude in Fal-

*Prayer for
the Dead,
tormented
with a
temporal
punish-
ment,
Evidently
proves a
Purgatory.*

sity, is more untrue. You se moreover How forceable that usual Argument is for Purgatory. *The Greek and Latin Church* (yes and the *Ancient Church of the Jewes also, as I shall presently Declare*) *Prayed for the Dead, Ergo there is a Purgatory,* or, which is the same,

*Prayer not
made for a
joyful Re-
surrection
only &c.*

Purgatory is as certain, as it is certain that these Churches pray for the Dead tormented with a Temporal punishment. Now, if after all, you Answer. They only prayed for a joyful Resurrection, or, meerly for a solace of

souls dwelling, as you seem to suppose, in dark Receptacles, or finally, that they may Escape the flames of fire which shal be at the Day of Judgment, you do not only Vent your own Fancy without Proof, but moreover Contradict the Authorities now cited, wher-

by it is Evident, that Prayers were made to free souls from a temporal punishment, during this our time of Exile, to acquit them of Debts Contracted in this life (so

S. Austin prayed for His Mother lib. 9. Confess. c. 13.)

and

and Finally to Transferr Them from a present doleful State, to Blifs and Happines before the Day of Doom. And, Hence it is, that the Greeks in Their *Paracleti- ca* cited by *Alatus* page 144. Petition Almighty God, when the soul is departed, for its speedy passage into Paradise without let or impediment. Hence also *S. Chrysostom* *S. Chrysostom's prudent Coun- sel.* (quoted page 145.) *Orat. 5. de Penitentiâ*, Exhort's all to make the Judge Gracious and favorable before They come to the Tribunal; For, saith He, when the Judge Sits, there is no appeasing no mitigating of his sentence, neither power, Eloquence, or Dignity will Do it; And the reason is, as *Alatus* well observes, For, in this General Tribunal, *Non dimittuntur peccata, sed judicantur*, sins are not forgiven but judged only, *Expectanda est sententia & retributio*. A just sentence and a Recompense due to every Ones desert's are Here Heard of without further Pardon. Ponder therfore well the Argument now proposed with all its Circumstances. The Church Prayes for the Dead, And, not for a joyful Resurrection only, not for their sole solace, in no man knowes what Dark receptacles, &c. But, she prayes for souls now actually in grievous tormens &c. Ponder, I say, These particulars well, and you'll find the Argument most pressing, and *unanswerably Convincing*.

13. You se thirdly, How weakly some of your Brethren Cavil, whilst they pretend, That our Doctrin of Purgatory Comes much to the same with *Origens* Opinion Concerning a Vicissitude of Misery and Happines belonging to souls Hereafter. It is a pure Fiction, For *Origen* thought this Expiation don by the Fire that will burn the world at the Day of judgement. Catholiks say Contrary, It is made presently after Death.

Sins not re- leased in the general Judge- ment, but sentenced.

The Argu- ment with its Cir- cumstances convinceth.

Origens error.

*Quite
different
from the
Doctrin of
Purgatory.*

Death. It is true, if, by reason of the Straitnes of time, some be found neer that day who have not fully satisfyed, God can in a very moment Augment the Torment and supply that by an *intension* of pain which the length of time would have satisfyed For. Again, *Origen* sayd, this Purgation will be made in Hell fire, and for a determinate time. Catholicks own no such Doctrin. Finally, He held that not only Great sinners And the Damned, but the Devils also were to be Purged in Hell, which Expiation Ended, all of them are to return to a state of Happines. Catholicks Abjure the Errour, and Hold no redemption possible for either the Damned or Devils. Thus much of a meer Calumny.

*Our Ad-
versary
dissembles
Difficul-
ties.*

*His too
much For-
wardnes in
declaring
what He
know not.*

14. You se fourthly, no little swerving from Truth, when you, Sir, Tell us in your Preface to the Reader, *That you have been so far from dissembling the force of any of the Cathalick Arguments, that if you could add Greater weight to them you would have Done is, being as Unwilling to abuse your self, as the world.* All is Contrary in the present Controversy (and you mis as much in others) For, you have neither stated the Question rightly between the Latins and the Greeks (And Herein lyes no little fraud) nor have so much as slightly touched on any one Material thing now spoken of, And judge you, whether this be not a *Dissembling* of Difficulties. If you say, you never read *Alatius*, you have certainly in your Excellent Libraries more then one of those Authors He Quotes, and why were not they better Searched into before you writ of Purgatory? The Truth is (There is no Denying it) you were too forward in Declaring your Judgement concerning the Greek Church, before you well

well knew what it Teaches. Would one take the pains (and perhaps it may be don) to Translate your whole sixth Chapter into a known language, and send it to *Alatius* (He is yet alive, and can Answer to the Cause) with what Disdain think ye, would He look on't? How undigested a piece would he judge it to be? How far from Expressing what the Greeks Teach? And, Do not slight the man, for, He has the reputation of a most learned Scholler the whole world Over. However, if you Set light by his Person, answer his Arguments, His Reasons, and most Convincing Authorities.

See Alatius highly esteemed for his Learning.

14. If any one desire to know more of what the Greek Church hold's concerning the *Fire of Purgatory*, He may read *Alatius* page 200. where He cites *S. Basil* and others for a purgation by fire. You have much also of this whole subject in His Book against Hottinger, where He proves, page 130. Chap. 10. that the Greeks pray for the releasment of Souls, from their *tears and Torments*, And, that after the Ending of such punishments they may pass to eternal Happines. *In Ecclesia Græcorum*, saith He, *pagina 155. cap. 11. Unus fere est consensus omnium Græcorum &c.* Almost all the Greeks, even those who are against the Pope agree so far with him, that the *Blessed*, after This life, enjoy the *beatifical vision* with the Angels, and so *God facie ad faciem*. Now, Sir, if you would have an Answer (Though it merits none) to the pretty jeer you begin with, Concerning the vast *Incomes* of the Church by *Indulgences* (*Recall's* them *Pontificias emulgentias*) Read *Alatius* page 223. Chap. 12. where He washes away the Calumny, and shewes how severely the Church proceeds in this particular

Purgation by fire.

And passing into Happines after punishment.

The blessed after this life enjoy the beatifical vision.

450 Disc. IV. C. II. *Exceptions Against Sectaries*

No Salary
for Indul-
gences.

ticular charging All Officers of the Court not to take so much as the least Salary for the very Parchment, for the writings or any other labour belonging to the Indulgence, And to avoyd all Deceit, this Super-
scriptura goes with the Indulgence. *Gratis etiam quoad*
Scripturam. All is frankly don, without reward or recompence.

The Eastern
Churches
beside the
Greeks be-
lieve a
Purgatory.

S. Ephraim
Office ac-
cord's with
the Roman
Church.

The An-
cient
Church of
the Jewes
believed
Purgatory.

15. You may return once more to His Book de *Viriusq.
Ecclesie Confessione*, and page 272. find the Doctrin of
Purgatory Professed and believed as well by the *Syrians*,
Armenians and other Eastern Nations that Profess
Christianity, as by the Greeks themselves. *Abraham
Ecchelenfis* a Maronit (saith *Alatus*) And one no less skil-
ful in Ecclesiastical Affairs then in the Oriental Langua-
ges in His Notes upon *Hebedieusu* Bishop of *Soba* ex-
pressly maintains the Doctrin of Purgatory, and saith,
The Roman Church Innovates Nothing in this parti-
cular, Teaches Nothing, but what is read in *S. Ephrems*
Office, *Sive species id ad Purgatorium ignem, sive ad remis-*
sionem delictorum, whether that relates to the fire of Purga-
tory, or to the remission of sins after Death. Much mo-
re is there Alleged to this purpose, but the work
would be Endles, should we transcribe the half of his
Quotations. Yet one Thing is not to be omitted
which He as largely as learnedly proves Chiefly from
page 268. to page 300. And 'Tis that the Ancient Church
of the Jewes believed a Purgatory. He first urgeth that
known Passage of Scripture *Machab. lib. 2. c. 12.* which
though it were not Scripture, as Sectaries pretend, yet
the book is of great Authority, and was never taxed
of Errour by Christ and His Apostles or any Orthodox
Writer since Christ, and therefore cannot but be recko-
ned

ned of as an undoubted History. Next He Producess the Testimonies of no few learned Rabbins from page 278. whereby we have assurance that the Hebrew Church indubitably believed not only a Purgatory, but *the Fire of Purgatory* also: And here, were it worth the labour, I could charge my margents with Hebrew enough (borrowed from *Alatius*) as Sectaries usually Do Theirs with Greek and Latin, (I know a Little, and 'Tis little enough of that language,) but I Slight such Pzdantry, too manifest a bragging of Nothing. Good Apparel needs no Ribands, nor a solid Discours so much Margent-Bravery of *Hebrew*, *Greek* and *Latin*. If any particular *Emphasis* lie in a *Greek* or *Hebrew* word, it is worth the while to Search into it, but too much of the florishing (when every Boy Can transcribe a *Greek* or *Latin* sentence, if He have a book before him) reliseth not, For it only serves to show how vainly *Affectation* creep's in under a colour of Learning. Yet if this be the new Mode of Sectaries Let it pass, it is one of their least Transgressions.

*And the
fire of it
also.*

*Offen-
sation ever
Displea-
sing.*

16. Wel, Not to forget: *Alatius* page 277. cites you *R. Menachem Calomiti*, whose Writings are yet preserved in the Vatican Library, And This Rabbi tell's us what the Judgement of the Hebrew Church was, much to this sence: That if any soul be infected with pride or Error, it was necessary before its entrance into Paradise to be washed, and cleansed by fire in a place above Hell. You have yet a clearer Testimony taken out of the *Thalmud Massecher* quoted page 292. where a triple State of Souls is distinguished: Of perfectly just, of impiously wicked, and of a third sort who are

*Testimo-
nies of the
Rabbins.*

*The Temples
disting-
uished a
triple Sta-
te of Souls.*

first to descend to a place of Torment, to be tryed by Fire as Gold is: And for the relief of such imprisoned Captives, *Iudas Macchabeus* sent twelve thousand Drachmas of silver to Hierusalem as an Oblation. The Conclusion therefore is, *Sancta & Salutaris* &c. It is a Holy and wholsom cogitation to pray for the Dead, that they may be freed from their sins. But enough of this subject, if you desire further Instructions from the Rabbins concerning Purgatory, read *Matins* now cited.

C H A P. IV.

*A Parallel of Proofs for, and Against
the Doctrin of Purgatory. A solution
to our Adversaries
late Objections.*

1. **W**E come now to a just trial of the cause, to Proofs and Principles. Pray you observe. We will ballance all without partiality, and make the Parallel as it truly is. The Question rightly Stated is. *Whether there be a third place (distinct from Heaven and Hell) wherein Souls departed this life suffer a temporal punishment, From which punishments they are freed by the Prayers of the Living.* Call it Purgatory, or otherwise, it matter's nothing, we dispute *de re*, not *de Nomi-*
ne.

The Question truly Stated.

No dispute de nomine.

mine. Sectaries hold the *Negative*, Catholicks the *Affirmative*. And here is our first Principle.

2. What *Christ's* true Church, and all other Churches in the world *denominated Christians* Profess and believe, cannot but be an *undoubted verity*. But *Christ's* true Church and all other Churches with it Profess

The first, and most convincing Proof.

and Believe that *third place of torment*, as also a *Deliverance* of souls from it by the Prayers of the Living. Ergo that Doctrin is an undoubted Verity. The *Major* is

Evidently proved in the Precedent Chapter, For the true Roman Catholick Church, the Greek Church, and those more Eastern Churches, with the Ancient Orthodox Church of the Jewes, undeniably Profess and believe this Doctrin, none can gainsay the Proposition. The *Minor* is as certain, for no Authority under Heaven (plain Scripture excepted) can be greater

The consent of all Churches a strong Principle.

then the Vnanimous Consent of all Churches. No contrary judgement is able to struggle with so much strength.

Therefore, put the case first (you will have what I would say better Evidenced upon a supposition) That more then one of the ancient Fathers

The supposition hold's not de facto, for no Fathers teach so.

should expressly Deny a Purgatory, whilst all Churches teach the contrary. Suppose secondly, that God should command me to believe the One or Other, And that, which prudence evidently Tell's me is the most

What we are obliged to upon the supposition.

Credible, I am obliged, if I proceed rationally, to Adhere to the Church, because it is evidently the stronger Proof, and to deny the Fathers Authority. Therefore

I am bound much more, to yeild my Assent now when all Churches Affirm the Doctrin, and not one

Father Denies it. And our very Adversaries must say as much as I prove. For, do not they own the

Sectaries
must grant
what is
now offer-
ed.

An Obje-
ction.

Schisma-
ticks rece-
ding from
a Church
weaken not
the Church's Do-
ctrin.

The num-
ber of
witnesses
for a
Truth, gi-
ves some
Advanta-
ge.

Reasons,
pro, and
con, are
weighed.

Holy Book of Scripture to be Gods Word (how con-
sequently they proceed I Dispute-not) because all Chri-
stian Churches in the world do so ? If therefore that
Authority be warrant enough for a Bible, it is as
weighty for the Doctrin we stand for. And this
was my *Conclusion*. Perhaps you will say. Very

many among the Schismatical Churches Deny a Pur-
gatory. *Contra*. And very many also Deny the
Canon of Scripture you Admit of. Doth this make
the Bible of less esteem among you ? Know ther-
fore, We speak Here of *Church Authority*, and not of
Schismatical Parties receding from those Respective
Churches wherof they were once members; Know also,
that the Self-Opinion of such Partisans is not to be com-
pared with the *Sentiment* of a whole Church against
them. You may Reply Again. We are now forced
to make use of Schismatical Churches to Defend
our Doctrin of Purgatory. Answer. No such mat-
ter, We need not their Help, but say, *Salutem ex mi-
micis nostris*, when Adversaries agree with us in a
Truth it is an Advantage to our cause, witnesses upon
this account are multiplied, *Et vox populi vox Dei*, if
All teach as we do, it is certainly we profess no Erroneous Do-
ctrin. At least the Argument (*Ad hominem*) Against
Sectaries hath place, who value so much of the *Greeks*
and other Heterodox Christians, We care not for more.
Besides, the Greek Church, when it was most Ortho-
dox, prayed for the Dead in a state of sufferance, as is
already proved.

3. Weigh now well the Reasons *Pro*, and, *Con*.
All the Churches in the world Defend a Purgatory, that is a
place wherein souls are temporally punished: No Church supposed
Ortho-

Orthodox ever denied it. I say more: No Schismatical Church, under the Notion of a Church contradicted that Doctrin, Therefore our professed Faith is undoubtedly certain upon this very ground, or if it be not, one may call the primary Articles of our Faith into Question. And thus you have the first Parallel. All Churches stand for our Affirmative: No Church Defend's the contrary Negative of Sectaries. A most Evident Conviction: A powerful Proof against this Heresy.

The Parallel, All and none.

A clear

Conviction.

The second Principle.

4. The second Principle is *S. Anstins* known Doctrin *De Baptismo contra Donatistas lib. 4. c. 24. Quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec Consiliis &c.* What the whole universal Church hold's and was not first instituted by Councils, but ever in use and retained, *Recte Creditur, as rightly believed to be no other but an Apostolical Tradition.* But it is most certain, that the whole Vniversal Church prayed for souls departed, with intention to free them from a temporal Punishment: The *Greeks*, the *Latins*, and the Ancient *Hobrews* Prayed so, as is already proved, And this had no first Rise from any Decree of Councils, therefore it is an Apostolical Tradition, which Truth *Alatini* further demonstrat's upon several Occasions. Ponder therefore things impartially, And ask now what Tradition have Sectaries for their Negative? *The Dead are not Assisted by Prayer.* They have none, they are here put to silence, for, neither the Tradition of the whole Church, nor of any part of it reputed Orthodox, ever favoured Their Opinion or delivered what they teach. Make then the Comparison. All Tradition is for our Catholick Verity, and Nothing like Tradition for the contrary Heresy.

What all believe is Apostolical Tradition.

No Sectary can say, when the Church first began to pray for the Dead, suffering torment.

The Parallel,

All

All, and Nothing, make a strange Parallel. And so it is at present.

5. The third Principle. Many Ancient and learned Fathers so interpret those known passages of Holy Scripture usually alleged for a proof of Purgatory, that Scripture it self Speak's what the Church Teacheth. Not one Father gives such a sense to Scripture as may Ground a *positive or absolute Denial of Purgatory*. I cannot insist upon all. Take for an instance that one passage of the Apostle 1. Cor. 3. *He shall so yet be saved as by fire*, And know that besides those learned Notes of Bellarmin. Bellarmin upon the Text *Lib. 1. De Purg. Cap. 5.* and the Fathers there quoted most significantly expressing the Catholick sense, Leo Alatus produceth others, and Page 311. Cites Manuel Caleca a more Modern Author *Lib. 4. Contra Gracos*, who Saith the place cannot be understood of Hell fire, for the Apostle speak's of a fire wherby souls are *saved*, which is not the fire of Hell, but a *Purging fire*, and by this They are to pass to happiness. And so much the particle *diu* or *Per*, which insinuates a *Passing*, strongly signifies. Thus *caleca*, who hath much more to our Purpose. It is true some Authors think the Apostle speak's of the fire of Tribulation, Others (though less probably) of the last burning of the world, but no Father makes the Text or any other of Scripture positively *exclusive* of Purgatory, for This is *no Consequence*. We are to pass through Tribulation, and the fire also at the judgement Day. Ergo, *there is no penalty to be endured in a third place*. Here you have an other Parallel. Most learned Fathers interpret Scripture Conformably to the Churches Doctrin, not one positively favours the Contrary Opinion of Sectaries.

*Scripture
interpreted
by Fathers
a third
Principle.*

Bellarmin.

*Leo Ala-
sius.*

*Manuel
Caleca his
reason.*

*No Fathers
makes
Scripture to
Deny a
Purgatory.*

*The Paral-
led.*

etaries. Iudge you therefore, and cast as it were into a ballance the exprefs Sentiment of *Many* againſt *None*, and ſee where the greateſt weight lyes.

6. The fourth Principle is the Exprefs Doctrin of *The fourth Principle*, Fathers Themſelves, as well Greek as Latin, whether it be grounded on Scripture, on Tradition, or both, matters not at preſent: Here we only Appeal to the *Their Poſitive Doctrin*. To tranſcribe all they have ſaid on this ſubject, would be a long work.

Bellarmin novv cited cap. 10. hath many, *Leo Alatus* adds other Greek Authors as well Orthodox as of Schiſmatical from his 57 page. There you have *Gennadius* the

Patriarch, *S. Epiphanius* expreſs to our purpoſe, *S. Chryſoſtom* Hom. 69. ad populum, and *S. Damascen* both approving and praying *S. Chryſoſtoms* Doctrin, *Euftratiuſ*

Prieſt of Conſtantinople, *Michaël Glycas* a Schiſmatick, *Eugenius Nomophilax* adverſus Synodum Florentinam, *Meletius Alexandrinus* Epistolâ ad Chios, who ſaith Expreſſly, it is an Apoſtolicall Tradition, and grounded alſo in Scripture, To Hold that the Dead have great Aſſiſtance by the good works of the Living. But let us return to the more known Authority of Fathers.

S. Denis (or ſome other Grave Author) *Eccleſ. Hierarch.* cap. 7. parte 3. ſaith, that the venerable Prelate prays over the Dead, to the End that all his ſinn's committed through humain frailty may be forgiven him. Say I beſeech you, what ſignifies this remiſſion of ſin's obtainable by the Prayers of the Prelate? *S. Cyril* of Hieruſalem *Myſtag.* 5. We make Prayers and offer up the dreadful Sacrifice on the Altar for the Dead, believing it to be a mighty Help for their ſouls. What can be more plain Popery? *S. Chryſoſtom* Hom. 21. in *Alia*, *Alatus* quotes the words in his own language; which begin

Mmm

thus:

Greek Authors favour the Church Doctrin,

Dionysius, S. Cyril of Hier. S. Chryſoſtom.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

thus: *Ποιῶν ὑμῖν ὁ Θεὸς &c.* God, saith He, hath layd open to us many wayes to salvation. *Oblations, Prayers and Alms for the Dead are not things vainly don in their behalf,* No, *They were instituted by the Hol, Ghost, who will's that we endeavour to help one an other.* Be most assured the Dead have much profit by our Orizons. The Saint hath more to this purpose in his 41. *Hom.* upon the first of the *Corr. Theodoret* (cited by *Alatus* page 71.) *lib. 5. Histor. cap. 36.* Tell's us, that *Theodosius* the younger, lay prostrate at the Reliques of *S. Chrysostom*, praing for the Souls of his deceased Parents *Arcadius* and *Eudoxia*, that God would grant them pardon for their Offenses &c. *Alatus* besides These, cites *Theophylact*, *S. Cyril of Alexandria*, *Metaphrastes* and other Greek Authors. You have the Latin Fathers Largely quoted by *Bellarmin* *supra* cap. 10. And their words are so plain for our Doctrin (Specially *S. Austins*) that none without violence can draw them to any other sense then what the Church Teaches. Most surely, you will now expect that Sectaries Answer us with like measure, And give in lieu of these Testimonies (briefly hinted at) others as clear and significant for their Opinion. And this They are obliged to, when besides the alleged Authorities, we have an Ample, ancient, and learned Church that speaks in the language of the Fathers, and Teaches the very Doctrin They Deliver. But all is Contrary.

7. I'll tell you a great Truth, and 'tis worth a serious reflection. . . . Sectaries have not so much as one Ancient Father Greek or Latin, not one Ancient Writer reputed Orthodox, not one Council new or old, not one word of Scripture that either *Positively* and *Expressly*

*Oblations
and
Prayers for
the Dead.*

*The Latin
Fathers
accord also.*

*Sectaries
want of
Authors.*

pressly Denies a Purgatory, or Prayers for the Dead, or the relief we now plead for, afforded them in a place of *Punishment*. What not one? No. Parallel therefore many with *None* and you will see what foundations Our Adversaries Novelties Stand on. I say *Expressly* and *Positively*, being well acquainted with *Seclaries* Proceeding, as well in this as in other Controversies. Here They will first be upon you with their Negative way of Arguing. We read no such word as *Purgatory* in the Ancient Fathers.

The Parallel.

Seclaries way of Arguing.

2. You may have a Company of blind inferences drawn from Scripture and Fathers before the sense of either be Agreed on. 3. As far as Conjectures can reach, they will set Glosses enough upon the best Testimonies alleageable out of Scripture or Fathers &c. But mark it, all this while you have Nothing *Express*, nothing *Positive* and *significant* against us. And Do they think that a meer Negative Argument hath force enough to overthrow a Doctrin Positively Professed by a whole Church, and so many Learned Fathers? Can they perswade Themselves that Their Inferences Forced from Scripture or Fathers, are of any validity, whilst the very sense of both lye under Dispute? Take for an instance that of *s. Iohn apocal.* 14. *Blessed are the Dead that Dye in our Lord, Amodo*, from hence forth they rest from Their labours. The Question is, what *Amodo* relates to, whether to the day of every mans Death, or to the last Judgement Day? whether the Scripture speak's there of perfect Souls only, or of others? what is meant by that word *labours*; For if it signify the sufferances and persecutions of this present life, the Text Proves nothing for our Adversaries. Notwithstanding

They make Deductions from Scripture before the sense of Scripture is known.

An Instance.

all these Doubts undecided, Their Inference goes on. And 'tis, that *S. Iohn here Excludes all sufferance in Purgatory.* Alas, such Deductions are too weak to Oppose an Express owned Doctrin all over the world, as is now proved. Yet you have no better from these men. *Nothing Express, nothing openly significant* Against us.

8. I touched in the last place on Sectaries Glosses and interpretations, forced on such Testimonies, as are usually cited for our Catholick Faith. And here I will briefly Discover not only their *Cheat*, but moreover shew you how differently we and They proceed as well in this present Controversy, as in all other Disputes between us. Observe well, The Truth is thus. When we Produce Scripture, Councils, or Fathers against their Novelties, They make their own Interpretation to be the *last and surest Ground* wheron Their maintained Opinion ultimately relies. Contrarywise, the Catholick never interpret's Scripture or Fathers alleged by Sectaries, but He *ground his Gloss on a surer Principle* then his sole Explication reaches to. I will explicate my self more clearly by one Instance. Besides the Authority of our Church, and all other Societies called Christian, we allege (for example) *S. Denys* his Testimony, *S. Chrysostoms*, or any other to prove that Prayer for the Dead Avail's much for their comfort and remission of sins, that is, for the lessening of the pain due to sin. The Sectary interpret's These and the like passages as his *own Fancy* suggesteth, And if this Fancy hit not right, He is *undone*, for He hath no surer Principle, to rely on, either in this or any other Controversy, but His own self

con-

Weak Deductions.

How differently Catholicks and Sectaries proceed.

The Sectary makes the last ground of his Opinion to be his own Explication. The Catholick hath his Religion proved before He Explicates.

conceipted Gloss. The Reason is: He hath no infallible Church, no clear scripture, no undoubted consent of Fathers, no Vniversal Tradition distinct from his Gloss that can so much as make it probable. *All sure Principles fail Sectaries.* Therefore his own unproved interpretation Doth all; it is his last Principle and Strongest Hold, He never goes Higher, nor can advance one step further. I am so confident of this Assertion, that I challenge our Adversary to come to a just trial in this one Controversy; *A fair Offer.* And if He can Answer to our Authorities now quoted, upon the Assurance of plain Scripture, undoubted Tradition, or the plain Consent of Fathers, I'll cry *Peccavi*, and Ask forgiveness of my rashnes. Thus they proceed.

9. On the Other side, when the Catholick interprets Scripture or Fathers alleged by Sectaries against his Faith, He never makes his interpretation to be the greatest light or surest Proof of His Doctrin: but most prudently Answers, I am bound to interpret your less clear Authority brought Against me, becaus, I am Assured *Aliunde* by the strongest Principles Imaginable (whether my Gloss hit right or no) that my Faith is most certain. *The last Proof of a Catholick is not his Interpretation.* Christs Church tell's me so, Fathers Confirm it, None ever Opposed it but known Hereticks. Here, saith the Catholick, are my last Principles, Upon these I rest, And can you, my Adversary, Imagin that I being so well grounded, Ought to leave my certain Principles for a Dark sentence, or your unproved Conjectures? *He hath assured Principles to rely on.* It is impossible. You will se this more clearly by one Example. *An Instance.* The Catholick Believes a Purgatory. The Sectary saith His belief is against Scripture. (*Wisdom 3. The souls of*

the righteous are in the hands of God, and no torment shall touch them.) No such matter, Answers the Catholick, for if the word *Righteous* point at such as are perfectly just and need no Purgatory, your proof is proofles, or if the word *Torments* particularly signifies (as it doth) a racking or torturing forced on Malefactors, to confess the Truth before a Judge, the Text is wide enough from your purpose; For no such punishment shall touch the just departed. Now mark, saith the Catholick: Will you, Sir, have me to part from clear and certain Principles wheron my Faith relies for a Scripture, whilst the very sense of that Scripture is at least doubtful and obscure, and therefore may be well explicated without violence no way Contrary to the Doctrin of my Church? It would be a sin (and a great one) against prudence to yeild upon so slight a ground. I should make (saith He) an ill bargain, should I (as it were) exchange the sure Principles of my Faith for your uncertain Glosses and you have no more, Though you read the Text now cited till your eyes be weary.

*The Catholicks
just Demand,*

*A useful
Exchange
of sure
Principles
for uncertain
Glosses.*

*A great
Vnity
worthy of
Re-
spection.*

10. Upon the Occasion now offered, give me leave to Tell you one great Truth, *Viz.* All of us must (Vnavoidibly) either firmly Adhere to the Doctrin of our Catholick Church, in these points of Controversy, Or (may Sectaries Glosses sway with us) we shall be sure to Assent to that which is not only an Heresy, but according to Ordinary Prudence and clear Principles a thousand times more improbable and Difficil. Observe it in our present Controversy. Sectaries hold it no improbability to say, That the Souls of good men do not enjoy compleat Happines till the Day of Judgement (Any thing may pass but
Po.

Popery) yet this very Assertion, if we respect Authority and reason also (abstracting from Faith) is less probable than our Church Doctrine is. Those quoted Scriptures prove Nothing to this purpose, as we shall show presently; for to find mercy at that great Day, *infer*'s not, that all Souls must stay out of Heaven till the second Coming of *Christ* to judgement. Note the like strain in other Controversies. They will have me to Deny the Infallibility of my Church, and will give me in Place of it their own *fallible word*, which I am sure cannot Stand in Competition with the sole *Humane Authority* of my Church. They will have us to deny the Popes Supremacy, And what Do they inforce on us in *lieu* of that? Nothing, but Their own jarring heads that agree in Nothing, And these must Teach and Govern us in *place of a Pope*. They will have me to Disbelieve my Scripture interpreted by the Church, and to believe their Interpretations; who are both *Churches* and *Scriptures*. Mark well, and judge you, whether that which *Se*ctaries would Drive us upon, be not in a high measure more improbable and difficile, than what we now believe, and it must needs be so, for, as I told you, the only support of their whole Religion, as *Protestancy*, is neither Scripture nor the Consent of Fathers, but their own Glosses forced on both, without further warrant. Follow them closely through all Controversies, you will find I speak Truth. Contrarywise. when the Catholick Interpreter's, He hath ever at hand a certain Principle *distinct from his Interpretation*, which is his security; For, saith He, I must either Interpret an Authority when it is Dubious, or desert those Con-

vincing

*The im-
probable
proceeding
of Secta-
ries.*

*They would
drive us
upon greater
Improbabilities.*

*The Catholicks
Security
when He
interprets's.*

vincing Principles wheron my Faith is grounded, which are without Controversy most certain : But to do so is madness, and a notorious sin against Prudence. Thus much by way of a *Notandum*.

Our Ad-
versaries
Objections.

11. We come now to Combate a little with our Adversaries Objections, but the Quarrel will not be long; For besides what is refuted Already, and some other Parergons, not much (as I think) to the Purpose, the remainder may be easily dispatched.

A hard
Rule given
the Fa-
thers.

12. He saith first : *Nothing ought to be looked on as an Article of Faith among the Fathers, but what They declare, that they believe on the account of Divine Revelation.* Mark the word *Declare*, and se, Sir, what a law you lay on the Fathers, they must tell their Readers when they write : *My Masters*, so much you are to believe on the account of Divine Revelation, and so much not : or if They fail in this *Declaration*, they may, as you seem to say afterwards, speak only their own fancies and Imaginations. *Contra.* *S. Iustins* writes of Purgatory and holds it, as we shall se presently; But Declares not *Explicitly* that the Doctrine is of Divine Revelation, nor *Explicitly* that it is his own fancy.

The Argu-
ment is re-
versed.

If therefore He Declares neither *Explicitly*, upon what Principle can you Assert, that he rather makes it a thought of his own fancy, then an Article of Faith. All you say, is : He declares it not to be of *Divine Revelation*. And I Answer, He Declares it not to be a thought of His own fancy. If then you suppose it to be his *Fancy*, because He declares it not to be of *Divine Revelation*, I may as lawfully suppose it to be of *Divine Revelation*, because He declares it not to be his own fancy. In a word your Principle is a Mistake. For, the Fathers

The Mi-
stake.

in

in their Learned Volumes often speak of matters of Faith, yet ever say not expressly *is id so*, and they often also touch on Opinative Doctrin, yet Cry not always out, *This is opinion only*. No, but suppose both known by other Principles without their *express* Declaration. You cite *S. Austin* in the next page, Asserting in Several places, That all *things necessary to be believed are clearly revealed in Scripture*. I doubt much of that word clearly, and of the several places too; but this is not what I aim at. My Question is, whether *S. Austin* declares himself plainly in those several places, that His Assertion is of Divine Revelation? If He do not according to your Rule, it is a Thought of his Fancy only, and therefore makes nothing for your purpose. Well after All, here is a better Rule. When the Fathers Deliver a Doctrin Conformable to the Belief of the Univerſal Church, you may rightly suppose it to be of Divine Revelation, though They Expressly declare not so much in their writings.

*St. Austin
saith ex-
pressly there
are many
things very
difficil to be
understood
in Scriptu-
re. de Fide
& oper.
c. 25.
The doubt
is of St.*

13. You say 2. That cannot be looked on as an Article of Faith to such persons, who express Their Doubts Concerning the Truth of it. But upon our enquiry into the Fathers we shall find (say you) the first Person who seemed to Assert that any Faithful souls passed through a fire of Purgation before the Day of Iudgement, was *S. Austin*: But He Delivers his Iudgement with so much fear and hesitancy, that any one may see He was far from making it an Article of Faith. To prove this hesitancy you quote two Places, *de Fide & operibus* c. 16. And *Enchir.* c. 69. I Answer first. You have not made a Diligent enquiry into the Fathers, if you think *S. Austin* was the first that held a fire of Purgation before the day of Iudgement. The contrary is manifest.

*Austins
Assertion,
not of Scri-
pture is
self.
A better
Rule.
A second
Objection.*

*St. Austin
was not the
first that
held Pur-
gatory.*

Nnn

by

He delivers
no doubtful
Doctrine of
Purgatory.

St. Austins
Drift Ex-
plained.

His words.

He thinks
such a pu-
nishment is
proved by
the Text.

To doubt
of Purgato-
ry and to
doubt whe-
ther such
a Scripture
proves it,
are diffe-
rent.

by the Authorities cited above. I say 2. This Learned Father Delivers no doubtful Judgement of *Purgatory*; but plainly Asserts it. I say 3. Your two Places prove not that He doubts of it. And to make this clear, you know the whole Drift of *St. Austin*, both in this 16. Chapter and the precedent, was only to deliver his opinion concerning the sense of the Apostles dark words 1. *Cor.* 3. And not to Define whether there be a Purgatory or no. This therefore being his main intent, He first reject's the Opinion of others, and Inclines much to the Affirmative, *Viz.* That the place Proves Purgatory, but not certainly. Hereupon follows what you cite: *Sive ergo in hac vita tantum homines ista patiuntur* &c. Whether therefore men suffer these things in this life, or such Judgements follow them after this life, *non abhorret, quantum arbitror, à ratione veritatis iste Intellectus hujus sententie.* That is in plain English. Such an understanding of this passage is no way, as I conceive, contrary to the true meaning of *S. Pauls* words, which is to say: I think a punishment is proved by this Scripture, either now or hereafter, yet am not certain. And therefore those next words follow; *Verumtamen etiamsi est alius qui mihi non occurrit.* Yet there may perhaps be another sense of them, which now occur's not to me &c. Now, Sir, be pleas'd to reflect. It is one thing to doubt of a Purgatory in it self, and another to Doubt whether it can be well proved out of this place of Scripture. *St. Austins*: *Quantum arbitror*, or hesitancy, as is manifest by the words, *Iste Intellectus hujus Sententie.* And, *Etiamsi sit alius* &c. makes only His Proof Doubtful, without giving the least hint of any doubt relating to the Doctrine of Purgatory it self. It often fall's out in Philosophy

osophy. and Divinity that a Doctrin is certain, yet some Arguments wherby it is proved are excepted against as profiles, or less valid.

14. To solve the other place, *Enchir. c. 69.* Note first A Principle of St. Austin, who, as we read *Tom. 10. serm. 41. de Sanctis* thought that some lesser sins, as too much love of the world and such like, are so usually purged by Tribulation in this world, *Ut in futuro ille ignis Purgatorius, aut non inveniat, aut certe parum inveniat quod exuras;* That in the next life the fire of Purgatory will find either Nothing, or very little to punish, But saith the Saint, *Si nec in tribulatione &c.* If in our Tribulation we neither give God thanks, nor redeem our sins by Good works, *Ipsi tamdiu in illo igne Purgatorio moras habebimus.* We shall stay in Purgatory till those lesser sins be consumed like Hay and stubble. And by the way note here also what Judgement St. Austin had of Purgatory. In the second place consider well the Connexion of St. Austins words in the precedent chap. 68. *Quia urit enim rerum dolor &c.* Because the Grief he hath for the things he loved, torments him; And what follows cap. 69. *Tale aliquid etiam fieri post hanc vitam incredibile non est.* It is not incredible that such alike punishment be after this life. What is not incredible? Thus much. That as some are punished in this life by a present Grief for their too much affection to worldly commodities, so it is not incredible, that some also suffer a torment in the future purging flames upon that account. *Et mirum est si quari potest.* And we may enquire, saith He, whether such a particular punishment be found in Purgatory, *Viz.* That by how much more or less men loved these transitory Goods of the world; *Tanto tardius citiusque saluari;*

A Principle of St. Austin to be noted.

The Connexion of St. Austins words.

Solves the Difficulty.

St. Austin
only doub-
ed of one
particular
punishment

The Testi-
mony
showed
foreles
against us.

A parallel
of clear
and doubt-
ful passa-
ges.

Solaries
over suppo-
se meer du-
bious Te-
stimonies
to have
more force,

saluati; So much sooner or later they come to Heaven. Which last words plainly give us *St. Austins* meaning, and prove that He *doubted not of Purgatory* (for He supposeth it here) but only calls such a *particular pain* into Question as is expiatory of lesser faults, because, as I told you, He held These lesser transgressions usually taken away by sufferances endured in this life. Conclude therefore, unles this Inference be Good, *St. Austin* doubted whether some faults were punished in Purgatory; Ergo He thought none were Expiated there, which is not probable, The alleged Testimony is of no force against us; yet proves that you read not *St. Austin* too well. Now if you say my Gloss upon this Authority is not certain: I answer, No more will yours be, when you have Interpreted all you can. Therefore neither of us yet come to a certain Principle, And consequently, you must produte a far clearer Authority before you Ask again, *Whether any man in his wits can think that St. Austin spake this of a matter of Faith*, Supposing all sure for your Interpretation, which to me, And I think to others also that know Latin and sense, will not appear probable. It is not my Task to quote here at large those most clear Testimonies of *St. Austin* for our Catholick Verity, yet I'll give you one, And wish you to parallel that with all your dubious places, lib. 2. de *Genesi contra Manichaeos* cap. 20. *fine*. Those books are of undoubted Authority. *Qui forte agnum suum non coluerit* &c. He that Cultivates not his Field, but suffers it to be overgrown with thorns, hath a Curson him in all He doth in this life. *Et post hanc vitam, habebit, vel ignem Purgationis, vel pœnam aeternam*. And after this life shall either have a Purgatory, or suffer pain

pain for ever. Thus the Doctor. And every man in his wits (it's your own phrase) cannot but think he spake of a matter of Faith, when his Doctrine agrees with the Belief of a whole Church. See more *then most clear ones, and the judgement of a whole Church.* lib. 21. de Civit. c. 16. Where He speaks of a Purging torment after Death, as also in Psal. 37. But enough of this point.

15. You say 3. *where Any of the Fathers build any Doctrine upon the sense of doubtful places of Scripture, we have no further reason to believe that Doctrine, then we have to believe, that it is the meaning of those places.* So that in this case the enquiry is taken off from the judgement of the Fathers, and fixed upon the sense of Scriptures, which They and we both rely on. *Two Propositions more unproved.* And you give this reason. For since the Fathers pretend to no greater Evidence of the Truth of the Doctrine, then such places do afford: it is the greatest reason, that the argument to persuade us be not the testimony of the Father, but the Evidence of the place is self. *Confused Doctrine.* Answ. If here be not a piece of most confused Learning, I never read any. Observe well your own propositions as they lye in order. First the Fathers are supposed to build a Doctrine upon the sense of doubtful Scripture; and then you say, you have no further reason to believe that Doctrine, then you have to believe that it is the meaning of those places. Very Good. But I ask, by what light can you better come to the true meaning of a doubtful place of Scripture, then the Fathers Did? If the meaning was doubtful to them, it is as doubtful to you; And if that sense which you draw out of a doubtful place be contrary to the Fathers, you wrong both Them and the Text; Them, because you Oppose their judgement

They cannot contradict the Fathers explicating a doubtful place.

No sure fixing on a doubtful sense

upon a meer uncertainty; The *text*, because you will make it speak your sense which it doth not certainly, for it is doubtful to you. Perhaps you'll say, When the sense is doubtful, Neither you nor the Fathers can tell what to make of it, and Therefore without further enquiry it will be best to let it alone, and remain in its obscurity. May this Doctrin pass: you need not to believe a great part of Scripture, for it is very obscure. 2. You are bound in Conscience never to contradict the Fathers interpreting a doubtful passage; For (and it is very good reason) if you will have the Fathers silent in such a case, you are to hold your Peace, and to say nothing against them. Your second Proposition. *In this case, the enquiry is taken off from the judgement of the Fathers, and fixed upon the sense of Scripture, which they and we both rely on,* Seems not to be too full of sense: For most assuredly, when the Fathers explicate a dubious passage, Their judgement tends to declare the hidden sense of it. Why therefore will you take their judgement off from such a sense, and put yours in room of it? Or to what purpose do you talk here of *Fixing* upon the sense, when a place is dubious, and neither Church nor Fathers must be believed? What is your *Fixing* good for, when you suppose the thing you *Fix* on to be doubtful, and your selves Fallible? If you say you must come to a certainty of the sense by Tradition or some other way, know that the Church and Fathers had better reason to be acquainted with such *lights*, then any Sectary can have. In a word. A doubtful place remaining still doubtful, or dubiously explicated can never beget a certain belief in you or any: Yet we say, when the

the Church of *christ* and Fathers also agree in an Explication the doubt ceaseth, and the delivered sense is most certain. In your reason; *For since They &c.* you leap from the sense of a *Doubtful* passage to the Evidence of the place it self, which seems not pertinent: For what hath Evidence to do here; when your Discours is only of a doubtful sense? When a place is evident we see that as well as you; And have with it the sentiment of a whole Church; and Consent of Fathers also.

16. You say 4. (After some Talk of two Reverend Primates which I much heed not) That *St. Ambrose* and others prayed for the Blessed in Heaven, Ergo Orizons for the Dead prove not a Purgatory. I wonder you weary mens Eares again, with such old worn-out Objections. You, or your Brethren have been told many and many a time, that no Father, no Church Greek or Latin ever prayed that the Saints in Heaven may be freed from any temporal pain, or for the Remission of sins; yet not only the Fathers, but these Churches also pray for both, and such a prayer Evidently proves a Purgatory. *Bellarmin* cited cap. 9. n. *Neque videtur*, tell's you, *St. Ambrose* hoped well of *Theodosius*, and Therefore rejoiced in his behalf; yet because He was not certain of his possessing happines, He prayed for him. And the like practise is yet in the Church, when men of great vertue depart this life. We pray for them if they stand in need, though we verily think they need no prayer. You know what distinction *St. Austin* makes *Serm. 17. de verbis Apost.* between Martyrs and others. *Pro ceteris defunctis*, saith He, *Oratur*; We pray for the faithful souls departed; but not for Martyrs. *Injuria est enim &c.* For it is a wrong to pray for a Martyr

When the Church and Fathers interpret, all doubts cease.

Old Objections renewed to no purpose.

The Church prays not for the Saints in Heaven to be released from temporal pain or to have sins remitted.

Disc. IV. C. IV. *Objections solved.* 4/3

Christ from the order of other men, because of the special honor and worship due to him, knowing that he is both God and man, and therefore cannot be ranked with other mortals, though most high in glory. Whence it is, we pray not for *Christ* no more then for God, because of his supream Excellency and Dignity above all other whether Saints or Angels, but offer up to him a Sacrifice of thanksgiving as also to his eternal Father and the Holy Ghost, as *Bellarmin* now cited well observes *v. Separamus.*

No prayer made for Christ, but to him.

17. You say 5. The supplications of the Church for the Dead respected mercy and forgiveness to be shewed the just at the day of Judgement, and consequently were intended for Gods final Justification of them by his sentence at that great Assembly. To prove this you cite many places of Holy Scripture, 2. *Tim.* 1. 16.

1. *Cor.* 1. 8. &c. Answer. The Church in the Mass for the Dead, whilst she represent's the terrour of that dreadful Judgement, speak's most Conformably to the sense of these Scriptures; And, as if that Day were to be the first Trial, doth not only make her Children Solicitous (*Quid sum miser &c. What then miserable men shall I say? What Patron shall I ask for?* When the just will hardly be secure;) But moreover teaches them to petition for mercy.

The Church speak's conformably to Scripture.

No me perdas. Destroy me not in that Day, call me with the Blessed &c. Yet, this Inference is not Good. The Church and Scripture speak of mercy and forgiveness to be found at the day of Judgement. - Ergo there is no third place of punishment wherein mercy is shewed before Judgement.

How the Supplications of the Church respect the Judgement Day.

I say therefore the Supplications of the Church for mercy at the day of Judgement respect the Mercies Don us before hand, when we

O o o

are Day.

Testimonies. Answer. We go not about it, but urge you to prove your erroneous Opinion Contrary to the greatest part of Fathers, and all Church Doctrin. And you are to do this not by talk, but by solid proofs and Principles. To what you add on your own head, that none of the Fathers hit upon a State of Purgation till *S. Austins* time, I have answered. and proved it to be a flat Calumny. Again, whereas you say, *the Apparitions and Visions* of souls departed are only pretended, and not real, Contrary to received History, we expect a stronger proof for the Assertion than your Word is, which is worthless, and most unmeet to make all null that has been writ of these *Apparitions*.

Sollarius
are to
look to
their own
Errors.

Appari-
tions of
souls too
slightly
rejected.

19. In the last place you come to examin the Testimonies of Some Fathers made to speak as you would have them. But *Bellarmin* before you were born, and *Leo Alatus* more lately have Answered, and proved all you say to be Proofles. I'll here only take Notice of your less candid proceeding, where *S. Cyprian* *Ad Antonianum de Cornelio & Novatiano* is quoted for Purgatory: *Aliud est ad veniam &c. Aliud missum in carcerem, &c. It is one thing to stay for pardon, and another to come presently to Glory. It is one thing to be cast into prison, and not to come out thence till you have paid the last farthing &c.* The Words, you know, are the same with those of Scripture, whereby Catholicks, following the Interpretation of Fathers, endeavour to prove Purgatory. Now you Tell us, *S. Cyprian* speak's here of the Severities of Pennance, which the lapsed Persons underwent in order to Pardon, and no doubt, as is easily gathered by the Context, His Epistle treat's mainly on

Bellarmin.
Leo Ala-
tus.

S. Cyprian's
words.

*Rigalt, and
Albasp.
deny not
the obvious
sense of S.
Cyprian's
words.*

that subject; But, that occasionally He spake not of Purgatory, or That this matter was wholly unthought of in this place, is more then either you or any can make probable. You say *Rigaltius* and *Gabriel Albaspinianus* understand the Passage of Pennances suffered in this life. Be it so. Neither of them excludes the other sense which the words bear and most properly. The intent of these Authors was to Declare that wherof *s. Cyprian* Chiefly Discourses, and not to meddle with every point of Doctrin occasionally touched on. Be it how you will, your Argument barely Negative: (*Rigaltius* and *Albaspinianus* apply not this place to Purgatory, Ergo they thought it proved not Purgatory) is forceles, whilst others Positively judge the contrary. And here I must complain a little. Sir, why Do you, who pretend to Dissemble nothing that makes for our Advantage, slipt over so silently *Iacobus Pamelius* his notes upon these words. *Aliud missum* &c. where He saith. *Mirè facit hic locus ad Confirmendam Ecclesie Traditionem de Purgatorio* &c. The place of *S. Cyprian* makes Marvellously well for Purgatory: And so the most Reverend Bishop *Martinus Peresius Ayala* before me observed very rightly. Thus *Pamelius*, whose Positive and Express Authority quite Outweighs your bare Negative, And argues you of some little Dissimulation. But,

Proofs Dissembled.

Proofs Compared.

20. I must end, and tell you a great Truth. What ever you can Allege in this matter is either purely Negative, or worth Nothing. We have the Authority of a Learned Church for our Doctrin. You have none for yours. We have the express Testimonies of Innumerable Ancient Fathers, you have not one that

ex-

expressly Denies Purgatory. Admit (which is untrue) *St. Austin* to have been the first that asserted our Doctrine, you have none so Ancient and learned as He that positively Contradicts it, No, nor one less learned. What then have you for your Novelty? bare Conjectures, uncertain Authorities, unproved interpretations of certain ones aginst you which are ever more obscure and weaker then the Text is which you Interpret. In a word you have *Fancy* and (Though you take it ill, I must speak truth) it is the sole foundation of your whole Religion. And because I say so much, I shall endeavour to prove it further, which will be best don by examining One other Controversy.

C H A P. V.

*An Objection Proposed, and Solved
in A Discours of Another Con-
troversy.*

1. **S**OME Perhaps may Think We Slight our Adversaries too much, And Tell them too often of *Fancy*, of their *Unreasonableness*, and Grounding nothing on certain *Principles*. For who can doubt, but that in most Controversies how on Foot, They seem to say Some thing Which Tend's as wel to the *Establishment of their Own*, as To the *weakening of our Catholick Doctrine*; Therefore, we do ill in Treating them so Uncivilly As if all They said were *Fancy*, *Weightles*,
O o o 3 and

If Sectaries think their cause rationally Defined. and insignificant. To answer this Difficulty home it would be Necessary, To run over All the Disputed Controversies between us, And to shew their weak Ground in every particular matter of Difference. But this is not Suitable now, nor can be Complied with, when you see a Treatise Grown to long Already.

The Decision of one Difficulty will show Their error. 2. Yet to satisfy the Reader, I will briefly Touch on one Controversy more. (it may serve as an Instance for Many) which hath been matter of Contention these last Hundred Years. In a word: It is, *That so long Debated Question concerning the Real Presence of Christ our Lord in the holy Eucharist.* And to Gain what time we can, it will be best to Wave a Needles Strating of the Question; For, all know what Catholics Believe of this Mystery, and Sectaries Do not, what Those Affirm, and These Deny.

Two ways in handling this Question of the Blessed Sacrament. 3. Now in Handling this Matter, We might Proceed two Different Wayes, And first, not only Bring to Light again the large Testimonies of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers in Behalf of our Catholick Verity. But also draw Arguments at length from their clear Expressions, for a greater Evidence of Truth: But This would be *Actum agere*, to Do what Hath been often Don by Others and very compleatly. The other way is Shorter, which Supposeth these Authorities Faithfully Quoted by our Catholick Writers: You Have them largely in Bellarmin, Through every Age since Christ, lib. 2. de Euchar. cap. 1. usque ad 29. *Exclusivæ*; And if the Reader know not Latin, He may find most of them, in that Excellent English book called, *A Disputation of the Church*, by E. S. F. Printed at Doway 1640. Chiefly in His 5. Book c. 6. Sectaries Acknow-

We follow the Shorter way.

Acknowledge these Authorities, wherat I shall briefly hint Hereafter. So far Therefore, There can be no Difficulty; The only Strife will be How They'l come off in their Answers, And, Whether They are able to Satisfy Two or Three Arguments, Which I shall Propose upon most grounded *Suppositions*. If I be not much Deceived, We shall se how Fancy all along, or something wors, Vphold's Their new Opinion. You must here Expect plain Language, For Truth is never better seen, Then when plain Words set it forth.

Sacraments cannot doubt of the Truth of their here supposed.

4. To proceed clearly. We may first Suppose, That as God hath Certainly Revealed the Truth of this Mystery of the *Blessed Sacrament* in Holy Scripture, so He hath also Taught us, What we are Truely to Believe concerning it. We Suppose 2. That his real Intention, was, and is, That we stand to his Word, and Believe Him as he Speak's, Vnles, we can Learn by some clear and Vndoubted *Principle*, That he spak Reservedly, or, That his words bear another Sense then what they plainly Signify. Vpon these *Suppositions* I Argue. When God Reveals a Truth in Holy Scripture, which concerns the General Belief of all, And *really Intends* to Teach Christians what They are to Believe of that Revealed Truth: He cannot Deliyer *more significantly, clearly, and expressly*, that Doctrin which He would not have Christians to Believe, Then He Doth the Doctrin which He Would have them to Believe: For, if He did so, (whilst We cannot Learn by any known Principle, That He speak's otherwise then He Thinks) He would not only Equivocate, and Deal reservedly with us in a Weighty matter of Faith (And this

Two necessary Suppositions.

A clear Argument Proposed against Sacraments.

God in a
weighty
Master of
Faith can-
not deliver
more clear-
ly than Do-
ctrin,
which He
would not
have
Christians
to Believe.
Then he
Doth the
other
which He
would ha-
ve them to
believe.
If God
cannot
make a fals
Religion
more credi-
ble to Rea-
son by out-
ward Mo-
tives, Then
his true
Religion is,
He cannot
deliver an
error nor
be belie-
ved in mo-
re plain
and signi-
ficant
words, then
he useth
when he
speaks a
Truth, to be
believed by
All.

480 Disc. IV. C. V. Another Controversy

this as Ill becom's his Goodnes as to Speak an Vntruth)
But more; if we Rely on Scripture only, He would
Induce the whole world to Believe a Falsity. Now I
Subsume. But, it is most Evident, (if Sectaries Say
right) That God, in speaking of this Mystery, Deli-
vers that Doctrin more clearly, And significantly, Which
He would not have Christians to Believe, Then He
doth the other, which He would Have them to Believe,
And, there is no Imaginable Principle, wherby we can
learn that he Spake otherwise then He Thought, or his
plain Words Signify, Therefore he speak's not only E-
quivocally, and Reservedly in a weighty matter of
Faith (which is *Alwayes to be Reflected on*) But, He Indu-
ceth also the whole Christian World, if Scripture gui-
de us, to Believe a Falsity by His too plain Speaking.

5. Before I Prove the *Minor*, And give you this Clearer
Language of Almighty God, For *what He will not Have*
us to Believe &c. Be pleased to call to mind *one Truth*
Explicated more largely *Disc. I. cap. 8.* For it is the
Ground of my Present Discours. Upon that *Principle*
therfore, I say now Again. As God cannot (if True
Faith be in the world) make a Fals Religion more Pru-
dently Credible to Reason by the force of rational Mo-
tives, Then His True Religion is Evidenced and made
Credible (For, if he did so, He would oblige Reason to
Embrace a Falsity, and Desert Truth) So also, when He De-
livers a Doctrin Concerning Christian Faith (And, in
the most serious Circumstances imaginable) He cannot
Deliver an Error in more Emphatical and Plainer words
Then He speak's a Truth, which yet, You Shall se, is
Don, if Sectaries be Believed. The Parity Holds Ex-
actly, For, As those more Perswasive Motives, Ante-
cedent

cedent to Belief, whereby we are, as it were, summoned to settle our Faith right, Would, If They Countenanced a Fals Religion Prudently Induce Rational men to embrace that, and Leave the Discountenanced true Religion, so, This very clearer Language of God Whereon our Faith immediately Relies, Would Also, if it be more Express and Significant *For Error, then Truth,* Force All to Embrace the Error and Abandon Truth, Becaus the Error is most significantly Expresed in Holy Writ, And the Truth not at All : And This is Don, when there is no excogitable Grounded Principle to Draw us of the supposed Error, if we be Beguiled, or, to work this supposed Falsity out of our Harts, But the meer Fancy, And the bare Word of a few Sectaries, who say we are Deceived.

The party hold's exactly.

Fancy, or the bare words of Sectaries cannot

work out of a Christian's Hart, the open sense of Christ's words,

How Christ speak's, and what Catholics

believe, Sectaries must say, That Christ's words taken in their plain

literal sense are fals.

6. Now to prove the *Minor*, And Demonstrate that God delivers more Fully, and significantly the Doctrin, Which He would not have Christians to Believe, then he doth the other : Ponder these two things. First, what Eternal Truth Speak's in this Matter, And we Catholicks Believe. 2. What Sectaries say He speak's, And They Believe. These are *Christ's words.* *This is my Body. This is my Body, Which is Given for you. This is my Blood of the new Testament that shall be Shed for many.* Take heed, say Sectaries, Read warily, These words *Taken in Their Plain, literal, and most Obvious sense* are Fals, and Therefore Express not the Doctrin we are to Believe. Again *Christ* Speak's Thus. *This is the Chalice of the new Testament in my blood, which (Chalice το ποτηριον το ενχυομενον) is, or shall be Shed for you. Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is*

P P P

drink

drink indeed. No such Matter, say Sectaries, This is not the Doctrin we are to Believe, For, these words Understood in Their Plain Obvious sense are Fals. *That Chalice Shed For us, was not his blood, but wine of the grape. We eat not the flesh of the Son of man, nor drink his Blood, But, only eat Bakers Bread, and Drink Natural wiffe. His flesh is not really meat, nor His blood Drink.* Observe I pray you : Sectaries so Abhor The plain and Proper Sense of Christs own Words, that they make the *contradictory* Proposition to Him, Absolutely True in Every Particular, And his Fals; Therefore they must at least confess, that he *Speak's too clearly and expressly* that Doctrin, which They say we ought not to Believe; Otherwise, Why do They not Admit of his Words in Their open, and most candid Signification?

Sectaries
make the
contrary
Proposition
to Christs
words,
True.

7. Shall we next Consider, what Sectaries Believe of this Mystery, and withall Learn, whether *Christ* Delivers as plainly Their Doctrin in Scripture, As ours? Hear Their Profession of Faith: We Believe, Say They, That, that which *Christ* gave to his Disciples *was Natural Bread, Deputed to a Holy Use*, And no More: We Believe it to be a *Sign Only*, a *Figure Only*, a *Seal*, a *Token*, a *Type Only of Christs Body*, That is, We Believe, it to be His Body by *Resemblance, Symbolically, tropically, Metonymically* and *significantly*, Which is to Say, it Hath the name of *Christs Body*, But Really is no such Thing. And is This your Belief? Yes. Out with your Bible Therefore, And Shew me as Many clear Texts of Holy Writ, where, That which *Christ* gave to His Disciples in his last Supper, is called Natural Bread, a *Sign Only*, a *Figure, Token or Type only* of his Body, (For, This is the Doctrin, you say, we ought to Believe)

Sectaries
Faith of
this My-
stery.

Scripture,
no where
call's that
which
Christ ga-
ve his Dis-
ciples Na-
tural
Bread, or a
Sign only
of his Bo-
dy.

As

As I have now Quoted for the Contrary, where it is called *Christ Body and Blood*: Though you Suppose This to be the Doctrin We must not Believe. Believe it. These expressions. *This is my Body which is given for you. This is the Chalice in my Blood, which shall be shed for you, are* The words of our Saviour are plain and most Significant. most Open And Significant Language. Answer Me with Other Texts as Significant For your Faith, or to this Sense. This is not my Body, But a Sign Only of my Body, which is given For you. Speak Plainly, was it a Sign, or a Figure Only of Christ, That He, blessed Lord, Sacrificed on the Cross? Was it a Sign or Figure only of Him, That Judas Betrayed, or that Suffered For our sins? No. It was his very real Body, and this Body Truth that cannot Err, saith He gave to his Disciples. Once more, (I have right to Demand) Give me Text for Text, or Cast your Scriptures in a Pair of Scales for a trope, Figure, and Sign Only, and Lay mine now Quoted By Them, for the Reality of *Christs Body* Present, And Let that Side of the Ballance Fall, where you find most Weight of Gods Word, You will soon Perceive, How Light your Herefy is, Compared with Truth; And that without further Dispute, it Flyes up to Fantasy: For, There is not in the whole Bible, so much as one Syllable of these *Signes* Only, of these *Figures*, of these *Metonymies*, or any such Language. Indas betrayed not a sign of Christ Body, but Christ himself. Nothing in Scripture of signes and figures only.

8. We see Moreover. If Sectaries Speak Truth, The Conclusion Fall's on Them with a greater Weight, then They Imagined. For it Followes. That *Christ* our Lord Hath not only Spoken more *Significantly* and Expressly the Doctrin He would not have to be Believed, Then the other, which, They say, is to be

Sectaries would have us to believe a Doctrin contrary to express Scripture.

The Argument is proposed in other Terms.

If by a supposed impossibility Catholics were deceived in their Faith. They might justly blame Christs plain words.

To say that Christ beguile us, or that we are beguiled by him, is Blasphemy.

Believed; But also, That He obligeth us to Believe a Doctrin, And by force of Scripture, Which Clear Scripture is so far from Expressing, That it *Expressly* Teaches the Contrary to what They Say, All Ought to Believe. I might yet Propose this Argument in other Terms, and Perhaps with greater Force after this Manner. If *Christ* Delivered that Doctrin more Plainly which Sectaries Suppose to be *Fals*, and *Less* clearly, Yea, *not at All*; The contrary Doctrin, which They Suppose to be True, They, who ground All Their Belief on Scripture, must either Interpret the plainer Scripture *by the* more Obscure, yes (and I say) by no Scripture at All, And this is *pure Fancy*; Or, will be forced, not so much to Misinterpret, as plainly to Deny the Obvious and Open Sense of *Christs* own Words, And This is *wors* then *Faucy*. And here by the way you may gather. 3. If Catholicks, who Believe the Real Presence of *Christ* in the Holy Eucharist, Be Deceived in their Faith, They may, without Blame, Impute the Errour to no other cause But to the plain Speaking of our Saviour, and most Justly say: *Si error est quem credimus, à te decepti sumus. If we are Deceived, 'Tis you, Blessed Lord, who have don it. You Tell us. This is my Body, which is given for you. This is my Blood shed for many &c. You never uttered the least syllable in your Scripture of a sign Only, of a Trope, Figure or symbol Only. Say therefore, most impartial Judge, Wherin are we guilty, whilst We Expressly Believe what you Expressly Teach, And Reject a Novelty; which None But Hereticks Brought into the World? To Affirm, that Christ intended to Beguile us by his too Plain Speaking of this Mystery, is open Blasphemy: And*

to Say we are beguiled by him, is no Less An Impiety.

9. All that Sectaries can Pretend for Their Cause Against this Discours, is, That we yet Arrive not to the True meaning of *Christ's* sacred Words And Therefore They are ready to Teach us. Very Good. We are content to learn what is Truth. . But Before they Begin Their Teaching, it will be best for Them To

The Answer, if Sectaries pretend, we do not understand Christ's words.

Reflect, that we have here a *Proposition: This is my Body* &c. And because *Christ* Delivered It, 'Tis most True. Therefore, we have a *Subject* also, This, (school terms are necessary in the present occasion) we have a *copula* *EST*, *IS*, And a *Predicate*, or *Attribute*, My Body. Now, If our Adversaries will Vouchsafe to Teach, Let*Them first Please to Give us Plainly, the Total Object of *Christ's* Proposition, And Say what that *Predicate* was, which He then Connected with the *Subject* *Hoc*, or *THIS*. Did He say natural Bread, remaining bread, was his Body? No, 'Tis most Fals. Did he say by an Identical Enunciation. *His*

The total Object of Christ's Proposition is to be declared.

Body was his Body? No. Did He Say, that what He pointed at, was, By the Energy of his Words, made Really his Body? No, it is too plain Popery, and *Christ*, Say they, never Spoke it. How then shall we

Learn what he truly Asserted, or find a *Subject*, *Copula*, and *Predicate* in this Proposition? They Answer (And here is their best Instruction) it is Impossible to find either Truth, or these three Things in it; Unless They first Abuse the Words And Say, *Hoc est: Hec* Sitts *Christ's* Body, or, That this Bread, *Per communicationem Idiomatum*, is *Christ's* Body, or, That this Bread was made a natural Body by the Omnipotent

Sectaries can find no Truth in the proposition, unless they first abuse his sacred words.

Word of *Christ*, or, Finally Say, (To Omit other Glosses, And This sense best Pleaseth Modern Sectaries,) That the Word, *Est*, Imports not, *Is*, or any Identity between *Hoc*, and *Corpus*, But Renders an other Sense, and only Availes as much, As if you sayd, *Significat*, This Signifies *Christ's* Body. Read therefore the Gospel thus. This is my Body; *id est*: This Natural bread Signifies, or, is a *Sign*, a *Figure* of my Body, And we are Right, We have the Genuine Sense of his Proposition. Thus they Teach us.

A work of
Fancy,
And a
mighty in-
jury don to
Christ.

10. Here you shall see a Powerful work of Fancy, And the Greatest Wrong Don, I think, to *Christ*; that ever entred into a Christians Hart. To lay open This sin of Sectaries, I will not Insist much on their High Contempt of These sacred Words, Which, in a vulgar and Obvious Sense are as Fals, as if I should now say, Holding a Paper in my Hands, *This is my Body*: But This I must urge to their Confusion, And with All to take Notice of it. If the Interpretation now made of the Proposition be true Doctrin, it Evidently Followes, That *Christ* spoke so contrary to his mind, That He Hath beguiled the whole Orthodox Christian World By the most serious Words He ever uttered in this Mortal Life. I'll show you how: *Christ*, say Sectaries, Before He spake those words. *This is my Body* &c. Had only this internal Act or Judgement in his mind. That which I will now give to my Disciples, Shall be nothing *but Bread only*, or a bare Sign and Figure of my Body (for Sectaries Suppose He never intended to make bread his Body) yet hear how They make *Christ* to speak, As it were, contrary to his Thought, I will, saith Eternal Truth, Though I know That, that shall

Sectaries
must say,
that *Christ*
beguiled the
whole Or-
thodox
Christian
world by
the most
serious
words he
ever spok.

shall be Bread only which I am to give my Disciples, ^{Mark the} So Unluckily Express my self by *Outward Words*, as to ^{injury.} *Miscal the Sign* by the name of the Thing signified and ^{They make} *Avouch that to be my Body*, which Really shall not be my ^{Christ to} Body. But is here all ? No. ^{was his} Christ intended ^{Body} more in these mens Opinion, and Sayd in Effect ^{which} thus much. Though I now Foresee, That an uni- ^{really was} versal Errour will Follow Through all the ^{reputed Or-} *thodox Churches of Christendom*, upon my Dark and Im- ^{Three} proper Language, yet I will speak, as I do *Obscurely*, ^{Things} And Beguile Them (I know all will be Beguiled) ^{Evident in} Because all will Mistake my Meaning And Believe ^{the Princi-} That to be my Body, which Really is not. ^{ples of Se-} Thus ^{variet.} I foresee They will err, And the very *Emphasis of my* ^{The first} *words* will Cause this (now pretended) Universal ^{that Christ} Errour among Them. Therefore They cannot But ^{spoke im-} leave off to be Orthodox; For, a Church Erring in ^{properly.} so *weighty a Matter*, Or, That Adores a *Piece of bread* ^{The second} *for God*, is Absolutely Vnorthodox, and Hideously ^{that in the} Fals. ^{Moment} Sectaries, you se, grant, that *Christ* ^{He said-} *spak* ^{saw a uni-} thus Darkly, And, that by Doing so, He hath Drawn ^{versal pre-} all the Reputed true Churches on earth into This Per- ^{tended Er-} suasion, is a most Evident Truth; For, there was ne- ^{ror would} ver Any Church Acknowledged True in the world, ^{follow in} But such as literally Vnderstood his Proposition in its ^{all Ortho-} Plain and obvious Sense, And, consequently All ^{dox Chur-} Churches Believed the Real Presence of his sacred ^{ches.} Body, in the *holy Eucharist*; Though Sectaries say all ^{The Third,} Erred in that Belief. I Say All, for so *Lanfrancus* ^{that this} *Speaks* in his last book against *Berengarius*. *Omnēs qui* ^{universal} *Christianos se & esse & dici latantur*. All, who are Glad ^{pretended} of the Reality and Name of Christians, *Glory in this*, ^{Error} ^{would pro-} ^{ceed from} ^{no other} ^{Cause but} ^{from his} That

488 Disc. IV. C.V. *Another Controversy Examined.*

improper
speaking.
All Churches
Orthodox believe
the
Real presence.

That they Receive in the Sacrament the *True Flesh* and *Blood of Christ*, which was born of the Virgin. Ask of all, whether *Gracians*, *Armenians* or of what other Nation soever, *Vno ore hanc fidem se testantur habere*. All of Them, with *Unanimous* consent, openly Witness, That they have this Faith. Now, if our Adversaries Slight so *Worthy* an Author, let them produce but one as *Ancient* and *learned* as *Lanfrancus* was, That saith as much for the owning of *Their novelty of a Trope, Sign, Figure only* &c. And I will be Satisfied.

The last
Trial of our
Sectaries
cause,
which is to
lay Forth
the impro-
bability of
their new
Opinion.

11. And Here we come to the last Trial of our *Sectaries Cause*, Which is to shew you the *High Improbability* of their new *Fancied Opinion*. And therefore we are in the next Place, to Drive Them of All possible Ground to stand on, And Demonstrate That They have not so much as a *likelyhood* of any *undoubted Principle*, wherby, we may Learn, That *Christ* our Lord Spake improperly in the Passages now Quoted, or, That his Words have any other Sense then what they Expressly Signify, Which is our *Catholick Doctrine*.

CHAP.

C H A P. VI.

Seētaries without either Proofs or Principles, VVrest Christs VVords to an Improper Sense, And vent an Heresy upon meer Fancy.

1. **N**Ote first, when *Christ* our Lord said : *This is my body* &c. And used the like, or more significant Expressions (Registered by the other Evangelists) He did not only Institute the *Noblest of Sacraments*, But made also his *Will and Testament*, He Published a *Law*, gave a *Command: Hoc facite*, Do this. At least, all Acknowledge, That He Delivered a Dogmatical Verity Concerning our Christian Faith, And did This in such grave *Circumstances*, And to *such Persons* (His own Dear Disciples) That the *Time, Place*, and *Persons* to whom He Spak, Required no Dark, But most Plain and Proper Language. As therefore no Man makes his last *Will*, Publisheth a *Law*, Layes an Express *Command* on any, or Delivers a *Truth* which All are to Learn Under *Tropes, Figures, Metonymies*, or such Obscurities (These have place in the Dark Speaking of Prophets, and serve well to set forth an Oration) But contrarywise, in obvious Vulgar, and *Intelligible VVords*: So much

The Nature of a noble Sacrament
Christ's own will, a Dogmatical Verity.

And other grave circumstances require plain and proper Language.

Christ
could not
speak so ob-
scurely of
this Myste-
ry without
clearing all
in other
passages of
Holy writ.

Less can it be Supposed (when *Christ* our Lord spak of these Serious Matters) That He Delivered his Mind in Obscure *Metaphors*, *Tropes*, or any such Expressions: Vnles, as I noted above, We certainly Knew by more plain Scripture, Then our Saviours words are now cited, That, Though He beguile us Here, with *Tropes*, and *Metaphors*, Yet in other Passages of Holy Writ, He clear's all These dark Expressions by a contrary language, And Speak's more Significantly for these *Signes* of Sectaries Then He doth for our Catholick Doctrin. Vnles, I say, such Texts be at Hand Nothing can Force us from that *Express Sense*, which the Gospel most Significantly Deliver's, concerning this Mystry.

Though the
particle *Est*
in some
Propositions
may be in-
terpreted, it
Signifies.

That's not
enough, Se-
ctaries are
to Prove it
Beares that
Sense here.
An instan-
ce.

2. Note 2. Sectaries Advance their Cause nothing at all, when They tell us that the word, *EST*, sometimes Imports as much as if We said (*Signifies*) As when you se a Picture of Cæsar on a wall, and Say : This is *Cæsar*. The seed is (*Signifies*) the Word of God &c. Could this be proved, it is not enough, More is required, for They are Obligated to show, And by an Vn-deniable Principle (if my Faith Rely on their Gloss) That the Word *EST* in our Saviours Proposition hath determinatly that Sense, and no Other. You know Scripture saith. *Hic est filius meus dilectus*. This is my beloved son &c. Now, no Man can Inferred Beaus *EST*, sometimes is Rendred (*Signifies*) That Here, it looses its Proper sense, And only Avail's as much, as if you Said : *Christ* only *Signifies*, or, is not otherwise the Son of his Father, Then a material Picture Hang'd on a Wall is a Sign, or Figure of the *Prototypen*, This cannot be admitted of, Vnles, I say, a Stronger Principle

ciple (which is Impossible) Force us to Approve of such an Heretical sense. And thus We Discours in our Present Matter.

3. Note 3. All the Principles which can be Thought on, to Force Catholicks from the Received Sense of *Christs* Own Words, or, to Favour our Adversaries Cause, must be Reduced to one of these Heads. To *No known Principle upholds the Doctrin of Sectaries.* *Plain speaking Scripture.* To *Univrsal tradition.* To the Catholick. sense of *Christs* Orthodox Church in former Ages, or, Finally to the *General Consent of Fathers.* If none of these Principles Vphold Protestants Doctrin, it Fall's of it self, And wholly Relies on Fancy. Thus much supposed.

4. Here is my Proposition, and an Inference also. *Sectaries cannot by virtue of any one of these now Named Principles, VVithdraw Catholicks from the Plain Received Sense of Christs Words.* They cannot Prove that *EST*, in our Saviours Affirmation, Imports only as much, as if you said, it *Signifies.* Therefore the Doctrin which Denies the real Presence of *Christs* Body in the Sacrament, is wholly Vnwarrantable, and Built on Fancy Only. *A Proposition against Sectaries.*

5. The Proofs of my Assertion are as Vndeniably Evident as the very Assertion it self; For it is Manifest, No Scripture plainly Teaches (I say no More now) That the Verb *EST*, in *Christs* Proposition Beares only this sense, it *Signifies*; And it is as Clear, no Univrsal Tradition Approves of this new Fancied Sense. What then Remains, But that our Adversaries take Recours to some Ancient Orthodox Church, or, To the General Consent of Fathers? I say therefore. If they can Name any Univrsal Church, Nay any particular Church *The Proofs of it, are no less clear, Then the Proposition it self.* *A Fair offer made to Sectaries.*

Q q q 2

Church

*Proteſtants
you ſhall ſee,
will never
Answer
Dir-ctly,
to what is
here propo-
ſed.*

*What They
are to An-
ſwer To.*

*The ſole
Authority
of our Ro-
man
Church, is
ſufficient
to Convin-
ce Seſtaries
of Error.*

Church *Reputed Orthodox* the whole world Over, That Interpreted theſe Words as They do, or, Clearly *De-nyed* Chriſts true Body and Blood To be under the *For-mes* of Bread and Wine after Conſecration, or, Belie-ved that Natural bread only hath the Name of *Chriſts* Body, Though it be Really no more But a *Sign* only, a *Figure* only, a *Reſemblance* only of his Body; If, I ſay, any one of theſe things can be proved, They'l Come of Gloriously, And Gain Thouſands to their Opinion. But I know, all is in a high Meaſure Impoſſible. I ſay, a *Sign* only, a *Figure* only; For, We Catholicks both ſpeak with the Fathers, and Truly Believe The Eucharift to be a Sacrament, And conſequently a *Sign* of Inviſible Grace, Yea, and a *Figure* alſo, a Memo-rial of *Chriſt* Himſelf and his Sacred Paſſion; But this is not the Controverſy between us, The ſole *Queſtion* therfore is, Whether it be ſo *purely* a *Sign* or *Figure*, that the *Thing Signified* is not in the Sign, And the *Verity* in the *Figure*, That is. Whether *Chriſts* Sacred Body and Blood, be not *Truely* and *Subſtantly* within the out-ward Sign, and really Preſent There? This *VVe Af-firm*, and *Seſtaries Deny*, Though never Orthodox Church Denied it with Them.

6. To clear this Point, And Add, If Poſſible, more Weight to our Aſſertion: We Have an Ample, Holy, and Learned Catholick Roman Church (whoſe ſole Authority, ſet Scripture aſide, is the Greateſt on Earth) Which confeſſedly hath believed and taught this Do-ctrin of the Real Preſence for at leaſt a Thouſand Years (I ſay Ever ſince Chriſtianity began) And, can any one prudently Perſwade Himſelf, That ſo Choic, and Learned a Society, That yet *Speak's in Chriſts own Lan-guage*,

guage, And Literally believes his words as They are in the Gospel, Hath, for so long a time lived in a *cheat*, and taught *Millions* of Soules a most Damnable Errour? Admit of this Vast Improbability, We have yet a Demonstration against Sectaries: And 'tis: No Orthodox Church can be named that ever Opposed, Found fault, or Blamed the Belief of the Roman Church Concerning this Mystery. Therefore the Doctrin of this Learned Society is undoubtedly *certain*, upon a double Account, that *Christ Taught it*, And no Vniversal Church ever *condemned it*.

No
Other Orthodox Society Ever
opposed our
Catholick
Doctrin.

7. In the last Place we are to Say a Word of the other Principle, Which is the Vnanimous consent, not of a small Number, but of Many most Ancient, Learned, and Holy Fathers, These can well Declare what Scripture Teaches of This Mystery, And what *Christs* Orthodox Church ever Believed. If All Readers Have not the Originals at hand, They may see them in the Authors Cited above, I shall only Hint at a few, For to Transcribe All, or Half of them, And Quote the Places Exactly, Would Needlessly lengthen a Digression, which I Intended to make short. In passing I'll only say thus much. If Sectaries, with all the Skill They have, can Interpret These few Testimonies, Which I shall briefly Glance at, They may with the same Ease, Yea, And far less labour, Explicate the Words of the *Council of Trent*, and make that to speak Protestancy, Or to Deny the Real Presence.

The last
Principle
which is
the consent
of Fathers.

Fathers
express for
Catholick
Doctrin.

8. Some Fathers therefore Dogmatically Teach: What we take into our mouths, is not that which *nature made*, But what the Blessing hath Consecrated,

These Fathers are
Faithfully
cited,

Thought to avoid tediousness in a short Digestion, I thought it best, not to give the Reader more Trouble than is necessary, by quoting Exactly the places.

You have the most of them in Bellarmin, and the other Authors named above.

If Any Doubts of These Authorities, I oblige my

And that by Consecration the *very Nature* of bread is changed. Thou hast learned that of bread, is made the Body of Christ, and the wine and water is put into the Chalice, But by the consecration of the Heavenly Word, it is made Blood. The Bread and Wine of the Eucharist, before the Sacred Invocation of the Adored Trinity, were simple bread and wine, But the Invocation being once done, the Bread indeed is made the Flesh of Christ, and the Wine his Blood. The Bread which our Lord gave to his Disciples, being changed not in shape, but in Nature, by the omnipotency of the Word, is made Flesh, Christ, by his own Will, once changed water into wine, and is He not worthy to be Believed, that He changed Wine into Blood? Mark a substantial change. Wherefore, with all Certainty let us take this Body and Blood of Christ: For his Body is given thee under the Form of Bread, And his Blood is given thee under the Form of wine, Although sense tell thee Otherwise, yet let Faith confirm thee in this Truth. That which appears Bread is not Bread, Though it seem so to the Taste, But it is the Body of Christ: And that which appears wine is not wine, as the taste Judges it to be, But the Blood of Christ. The Consecrated Bread, is not a figure only *types* of the Body of Christ, But the very Deified Body of our Saviour. The bread and wine are Supernaturally changed, or Transmade into the Body and Blood of Christ. Christ was Carried in his own Hands. To the exterior Sense it seems to be Bread, But know, by the sense of your Understanding, That it is my Body, not an Other, But the same in substance, which shall be Delivered to Death for you. Other Fathers say. The same body is on the Altar, which is in Heaven, The same Blood is in the Chalice which Issued out of our Saviours side. He gave us that very flesh wherein he walked here, to be eaten to Salvation. It is the

same flesh of our Saviour, which suffered for our Sins, which self to quote was on the Cross, which was Born of the Virgin, This Body we Receive and Eat with our mouths, and have it mingled with our Bodies.

9. Thus the worthiest Fathers of our Christian Faith speak, And as I said just now, Neither the Council of Trent, nor, Any Modern Catholick can speak more significantly in Behalf of the Doctrin, We All Profess. I Say also. No Ancient Fathers ever Expressed Themselves with Greater Energy, when They treat of that High Mystery of our Faith, *The sacred Trinitie*, which Sectaries joyntly Believe with us, Then These have Don in the present Mystery of the Blessed Sacrament. I Appeal to our Adversaries own Consciences, And ask whether They can Contradict me? If they Do, I must Tell them, they cannot Think it, or, if They Seriously Judge so, Their Judgement, Because Contrary to the greatest Part of the Christian world, is *Weightless*, And (finally resolved) comes to no more but *Fancy*. I have told them often in this Treatise, That, any Heterodox May with greater Ease, and lesser Violence Offered, either to Scripture or the most Primitive Fathers, Turn off all that can be Said for the Proof of any Christian Verity Then They are able to Enervate the plain Words of *Christ* and Fathers, now alleged for this Mystery.

10. Be it How you will, Our Adversaries, if They'll yet Wilfully run on in an Heresy, Are at least Obligated to stand on Equal *Terms* with us, To give us Proof for Proof, Weight for Weight, Measure for Measure. Here are our Principles. We have Plain and Express Scripture for our Catholick Verity, They have not a Word.

We Declared,

to the places exactly, Now only omitted because they are vulgarly known.

The expressions of Fathers, as significant for This Mystery, as for a Trinitie.

Sectaries may with greater Ease Deny Any Christian Verity, then this Mystery. They are at least obligated to Match us with equal Proofs. The Catholick Principles, briefly

*Sectaries
want all
these Proofs
and Prin-
ciples*

*A sad
Thought
for Sediti-
ous.*

*What
Marks and
Signs ac-
company
This Here-
sy.*

We Plead our Cause by a Constant and never Interrupted Tradition, They have None. We have a Renowned, Ample, and most Learned Catholick Church, which both Believed and taught this Catholick Doctrin, They have neither Orthodox Church nor Chappel, that Taught or Talked, seven hundred years ago, of Their *Tropes, and Figures only*. We have the General Consent of Fathers, They have only *Patches* and *Fragments* weighed out of their Circumstances, for Their Condemned Opinion. We have Miracles, Clear and *Vndeniable Miracles*, which confirm our Doctrin: Both Ancient Fathers and Modern Doctors Recount Them, who cannot be Supposed, to have wilfully Damned Their Soules by Obliging Posterity to *Believe Impostures* upon Misinformation. They have neither Miracle nor Sign, But the Empty Sign of a Piece of Bread, For their too long known, And as long since Decryed Heresy. Finally (And here is a sad Thought for Sectaries) If ever Heresy was in the World, This of Theirs is, or never any Deserved That Name. At least, All the *Marks*, All the *Signs*, All the *Characters* of Heresy follow it, That can be Imagined. It is a late Found out and a new Invented Opinion. The Chief Author of it, *Berengarius* (no Saint I'll promis you) is Known. The time *When*, And the Place *Where* it Began, *The few Followers it then Had*, the Trouble it Caused among Orthodox Believers, the *Opposition* made Against it, *The Trial, The Examination, the Sentence and Condemnation* of it, Are Known, And All upon Record. Almost every Catholick Author that Handles this Subject, Assert's and Proves what I say, by *Vndeniable History*. Could our new
Men

Men Allege But half as Much Against our Catholick Doctrin; Could They Point out The First *Broachers* of this Popery; Could They name the Place, the Time of its first Rise, Or, Tell us what Orthodox Church, After a Severe Examination *condemned* it, They might take courage, Speak Boldly, And well Hope to Drive us of our Principles. But, when we find them Vnaccountable in These Particulars, and see Evidently They cannot look one of these Difficulties in the face, nor Hint Probably at the least *sign* of any Novelty in our Doctrin. When Again we Reflect, How easy Their *Tenent* is to Sense, and Ours contrary very Difficil, (And therefore could not hiddenly Creep into the world without Clámours Against it.) When we seriously Consider, That both the *Latin* and *Greek* Church, though now at Variance in other Points, yet well *Agrée* in one Profession, of Faith concerning this Mystery. Finally, When we know, that the Greatest part of the Christian world (Wherof many were, and are, no less Profoundly Learned, then Eminent in Sanctity) Hath notwithstanding the Opposition made by Sectaries, believed as We Do to this Day, and Dyed in that Belief. We may Hope to Silence these Men Hereafter, and Well *Conclude*: That our Doctrin, which stand's sure on *Christ's plain Words*, Which the strongest Pillars of the Ancient Church Uphold, which the Roman Catholick Church yet Defends, And no Orthodox Church ever Opposed, Which Indubitable Miracles have Confirmed, and none Denied, But Known, and Professed Enemies of Truth; We may, I say, rightly *conclude*, That our Faith is *Anciently Catholick*, And therefore True; And That the contrary

Could so. Flaries Say but half as much against our Catholick Doctrin, could They weaken it by one of These Proofs.

They might Cavil more justly.

But nothing is spoken probably.

Other Confirmations of our Catholick Verity.

Opinion of Sectaries is a *meer Fancied Novelty*., And Therefore Fals, and Heretical.

Not one word of Scripture in the whole Bible for Sectaries.

11. We might yet Go on. (And to clear all) Answer now to a few Fals Supposed Grounds of Sectaries, But the Learned *Bellarmin* Hath done the work to our Hands, and Contributed more then Enough to Their utter Overthrow. Truly, is very pittiful to Se, How, after all their Braggs of Scripture, Scripture is Here so Scarce with them, That they cannot Find a Word through the whole Bible, so much as remotely Favourable for this Heresy. Observe wel what Straits They are put to.

How they Trifle in a most weighty matter.

12. First, the *Particle*, *EST*, in our Saviours Proposition, must either Sound as much as *significat*, (Signifies) or Sectaries are undone. And who Tell's Them so but Fancy? O, It often Hath that sense. I answer no such matter. For, *EST*, ever retains its own *simple* and *proper* Signification in every true Proposition, and doth no more but joyn's the Predicate with the Subject; what ever it be. The reason is. If any Trope, or, Metaphor, lie hidden in the *Copula*

They Err in their Interpretations of Christs Words.

No Trope or Figure found in the verb Substantive though often in the Attribute or subject.

la EST, it may certainly be Resolved into an other Word or *Diction* of a more Simple, Clear, and Open Signification Then, *EST*, by its own force Expresleth. But this is Impossible, For, no Word can be clearer then the *clearest*, more Open, then what is most openly significant: This *copula* is Always so, and therefore cannot be Resolved into any clearer *Diction*. And hence it is, That when your Rhetoricians Treat of *Figurative* Speeches, or Locutions, They never Placethe *Trope* or *Figure* on the *verb Substantive*, But either on the *Attribute* or *Subject*. 'Tis true, the *Predicate*, or *Subject* in many Propositions

tions, known (*Aliunde*) or by other clear Grounds, to be *Metaphors*, must be Explicated by clearer Terms, whilst yet the *Copula* *EST*, Holds its most Simple, and Proper Signification. Take one Instance. *Semen est verbum Dei*, The seed is the word of God. The

An Instance.

Word *Seed*, as it is a *Sign*, made by *Institution* essentially to Signify; so, in this place, it is a *trope*, or *Metaphor* also, (For certainly *Christ* said not That material Seed cast into the Earth is really his Word:) if Therefore it be here both a *Sign*, and *Metaphor*, you must ultimately Resolve the *Proposition* into a clearer Sense Thus.

The very Essence of a *Sign* is to Signify, This Word *Seed*, is a *Sign* *Ad placitum*, *Metaphorically* Representing the Word of God, Therefore, as well as a *Metaphor* can Do, it Signifies this Divine Word where you see, *EST*, keeps its proper Signification: And Therefore, The whole *Proposition* finally Resolved, Renders this

How Figurative Propositions are to be Resolved.

Sense. This *Metaphor* *Seed*, is a *Sign* signifying Gods Word: Now if you say We Grant at last, That the

Copula May here be Expounded, *Significat*; I Answer, most True, Yet without any *Trope* in *EST*, For, in such Enunciations, *Pradicatur Signum de Signo*, (as *Bellarmin* notes) The *Sign* is Predicated on the *Sign*; As in this *Proposition*. *Amare, Est, diligere*. That

is; *Amare*, is a synonimal *sign*, or signifies the same as *Diligere*, And therefore is Explicated by *significat*, Because the essence of a *sign* is to signify. But it is not so in other *Propositions*, where that which is predicated is neither formally a *sign* Only, nor any *Metaphor* at all.

Sectaries explicate Christ's proposition, without placing the Trope on the verb Substantive.

13. You shall see what I say now Evidenced in our *Sectaries* Opinion: For, whilst they Explicate *Christ's* *Proposition*. *This is my Body*, the *Copula*, *EST*, Re-

Rrr 2

tain's

tain's purely its own proper Signification, without any Trope. I prove it. When we find a Trope in a Proposition, it must lie *There*, or in *that Part* of it, into *whose place*, when the whole Proposition is *Resolved*, We put an other more plain and Significant Word to explicate the Trope clearly (by this Resolving of a whole Proposition into its Parcels we easily judge where the Trope is.) Now Observe. Our Sectaries resolve *Christ's* Proposition Thus.. *This is my Body. Hoc est signum corporis mei*. This is a sign of my Body.

The words
subrogated
to explicate
the Trope
with Secta-
ries be long
to the At-
tribute.

Mark well. The words Subrogated to Explicate the Trope, are these Two, *signum corporis*, But these two Words, which belong to the *Attribute* or *Predicate* are not, as is most evident, Substituted in the place of the *Copula*, *Est*, Therefore the Trope lies not in the *Copula*, which Keep's still its proper Signification, But according to this Resolution in the word *corpus*, or *Body*. Now How Fals it is, That any Trope lyes in the word *Body*, And consequently no where in the whole *Proposition*, is Evidently Convinced by our Saviours true Assertion. *This is my Body, which shall be given for you*. Believe it. No sign of his Body was given for us, But his Real Body. Be it how you will. Thus much is Clear, That the *Verb substantive*, even here Retain's its Simple, Proper, and most Common signification.

14. You may se more of this subject in *Bellarmin lib. 1. de Euchar. c. 10. §. secundo*, and *cap. 11. per totum*. Where He Learnedly Explicates other Propositions Alleged by Sectaries, as *Petra erat Christus*, *Agnus est Pascha* &c. All I'll now say, And 'Tis what I noted Above. Although it were granted that the *Copula*, *Est*, sometimes found's as much as, *significat*, Yet, unless this sense

sense Hold in All other *Locutions of Scripture* (which is absolutely Fals) our Adversaries are far enough from Proving their Intent, Becaus they cannot Convince by any probable *principle*, That, *EST*, in this place Hath that Determinate meaning, which They would give it. Therefore Fancy or something Worst, must Help them to Mantain this Improbable Gloss.

15. They Object 2. Those Words of Scripture.

Do this in Remembrance of me: And then Discours. We Commemorate no Body, nor Celebrate any Ones Memory, unles He be Absent; But *Christ*, As we Teach, is Always Present in the *Holy Eucharist*, Therefore we cannot make a Commemoration of Him, as of *One Absent*.

The Apostle *1. Corinth.* 11. Answer's the Difficul-

ty, For After He Had sayd: *Do this in Remembrance*

of me. He add's. *Quotiescumque enim &c.* As often

as you Eat this Bread and Drink this Chalice, You shall shew

the Death of our Lord until He Come; But the Death of

our Saviour is long since Pas't and not Present, Ther-

fore we may wel Commemorate his Death and Pas-

sion, as Priests do in every Masse they say. In Ri-

gour therefore, These Words Precisely force not on us any

Memory of his sacred Body, or Blood Present; But

only Mind us of his Action of sacrificing in his last Sup-

per. However, to Satisfy our Adversaries, be pleas-

ed only to put this supposition: That a Prince were

with his Nobles in a Disguised weed, And Would not

appear to their Senses but Disguised; Might they not

well, Although they knew otherwise He were their

Concealed Prince, and Present, not Only Reverence

and Adore him, But also make a Commemoration of

Him? Most certainly yes. This is our Case.

Sacraments are far from proving their intent, we are all granted they pretend to. A second Objection.

If is one thing to say, Do this Action you seeme Do in Remembrance of me. And another to say, the Sacrament is only a Remembrance of Christ. A Disguised Prince may be Remembered, though present with his Nobles.

A Sign requires not the absence of the thing signified.

As therefore that which we call a *sign*, requires not the Absence of the *thing signified*, For, the Ark of the Covenant was a Sign of God's *Present*, and the Dove Descending on *Christ*, was a Sign of the *Holy Ghost Present*: So, likewise a *Remembrance* or Commemoration Implies no Necessity of his Absence, that is Remembred. Finally, We may Remember our Lord and Saviour, as He is in Heaven absent, whilst He Feeds and feasts us here on Earth with his precious Body and Blood on the Altar. The Objection therefore is Forceles every way.

The Sacrament is not called Bakers bread.

16. They Object 3. This Sacrament is called Bread. Answ. But, never *Bakers* Bread after the Words of Consecration. *Fancy* only say's so, and no Proof. Again. 'Tis called Bread because it's made of Bread, as Man is called Dust: because made of Dust. Such Objections are Trivial.

Calvin saith, Breaking of Bread, is Sacrificing.

17. They Object 4. The Breaking of Bread strongly argues, 'Tis plain Bread, Though *Deputed* to a *Holy Use*. Answ. The Breaking here is Sacrificing, as Calvin Himself confesseth. The Argument, though it Proves just nothing, is seemingly more for *Luthers* Opinion of Bread, and Flesh together, then for our *Sectaries*.

A weak Inference of Sabbath.

18. They Object 5. *Christ* is called a Vine, a Rock, and a Doore. Answ. What then? Put a *Minor* Proposition to these Words, and Se How weak a Conclusion Followes. Is it any Consequence, that because figurative Speeches are in Scripture sometimes, Therefore all we Read there, must be *Tropes*, and *Metaphors*? We know, and the whole world knowes also by other Principles, that These are Tropes, And we

we evidently know by as assured Principles, that, MY BODY GIVEN FOR YOU. MY BLOOD SHED FOR MANY. Are no figurative Locutions.

19. They Object. 6. The *cup* is called the *Fruit* of the Vine, therefore it is not Blood. *Ans.* 1. It may be called Heavenly Wine, as *Christ* called himself Heavenly Bread &c. But the true Solution is. There were two Cupps on the Table that night before our Saviour suffered, the *Legal*, and the *Eucharistical*, or *sacramental Cup*; That's called the Fruit of the Vine, This not.

The legal, and Sacramental Cup, distinguished.

20. They Object 7. Some places of Scripture. *The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and Life. The flesh Profiteth nothing. All did eat the same Spiritual Food, and all drank the same Spiritual Drink.* * *Ans.* Nothing But meer Fancy, or something Wors, can Draw these Texts to the sense of Sectaries. The open and plain Meaning of *Christs* words without Violence offered to them, (easily Gathered By the whole Context) is Thus. I have spoken to you of Divine and Spiritual Matters, conducing to Eternal Happiness, But your Thoughts are still on Earth, As, if I were to cut off certain Pieces of my Body, and give them you to Eat (so *S. Austin* explicates this Place) it is not so, saith our Saviour, I spak of that more *Hidden Mystery of the Sacrament*, which Being Believed and Spiritually Understood, will Quickenn you and Give you Eternal life: The Flesh, therefore, That is, a *Carnal Understanding of my words Profit's Nothing* &c. This is the Genuin and candid sense of *Christs* Expression, For, it were a Blasphemy to say, that his sacred Body Profit's none. I Answer To The other Passage of *S. Paul*, *Its*, an Errour to judge,

The sense of Christs own words is clear, by the whole context of the Gospel.

If Sectaries can prove the contrary, let them do it by a sure Principle.

*The Apostles words misorder-
stood by
Secularies.*

judge, That the Jewes Received no *less the Substance and Benefits of Christs Graces in Their Figures*, Then We do in our Sacraments. The Apostle intimates no such Thing, But only saith. They all (the Hebrewes) among Themselves, *good and bad*, Eat the same Meat, and Drank of the same Rock, which was a *Figure of christ*. Now, Pray you Tell me, Do all Calvinists, Good and Bad, when They Receive *christ* by the *Mouth* of their Faith, Equally participate of his Graces? Or, were There any such Ample Promises Annexed to the Eating of *Manna* in the Desert, and Drinking the *Water* Issuing out of that Rock, as are now made to the Sacraments of the New Law? No. They were *Egena elementa*, Barren Elements for so Scripture speak's. You'll Ask, Why Then doth the Apostle call the *Manna*; and *Water*, Spiritual Food and Drink? I Answer, They are called so, not Because they Produced Grace as our Sacraments Do, But because They had a *Spiritual signification*, And were caused by a Special supernatural Providence, contrary to the Ordinary Cours of nature.

*Why the
Apostle
call's Man-
na Spiritu-
al Food.*

*An Objec-
tion con-
cerning the
way and
manner of
Receiving
showed
null.*

21. They Object 8. Such ought to be the Way of Receiving this Food of the blessed Sacrament, as is Answerable to the *Quality of the Food and End*, for which we take it. But, both the Food it self (to wit Divine Grace) and the Final end of it, which is a Union of the soul with *Christ*, are purely *Spiritual*; Therefore the Way, or Mode of Receiving it, must be Proportionably *Spiritual*: But, no *Mode* Or *Way* of Taking it, can be more Fit, or Spiritual then *Faith*; Therefore we are to Receive it by *Faith Only*, as the meetest Instrument. Ans^r. The Objection (no less improper in Speech,

Speech then simply *Fallacious*) Distinguisheth not rightly Between the Immediate Cause of *Grace*, the effect of *Sectaries*. *Grace*, and the *Disposition necessary* to Receive this Effect *distinguish not rightly between the cause of Grace, the effect is self, and the Disposition necessary to receiving.* Fruitfully. The immediate cause of grace, is *Christs* sacred Body under the Forms of Bread and Wine. Now to say, That his Body is the *Way* or *Manner* of Receiving our Spiritual Nutriment, is an Impropriety in Speech. And to say Again, That, this Body ought to be *Ejusdem planè rationis*, of the *self same* Nature with the Spiritual Food it Causeth, or, That a *Corporal thing* cannot be Ordained to Produce a *spiritual Effect*, is most untrue, For, the water in Baptism produceth grace in the *Baptized*, yet is Corporeal; the Corporeal visible Effusion of *Christs sacred Blood* in his Passion, Freed us from a *spiritual Death*, and brought us to a Spiritual Life. And do not *Sectaries* Hold, that the very Material Hearing of the *Word of God* is a fit Means to Beget Faith both *Spiritual*; and *Supernatural* in the Hearers Soul? The Difficulty therefore Proposed comes to nothing but Fancy. Finally, if we speak of the Disposition requisite to Receive the Effect of this Sacrament (you may call it, if you please, the *Mode, Way, or Manner* necessary to a due Receiving) All *Catholicks* Profess, that not only Faith, at least *Habitual*, but *Charity* Also, *per se loquendo*, Are Prerequisite as necessary Dispositions to the Effect thereof, Because it is *Sacramentum Vivorum* the Sacrament of Those, who now Live by Faith, Hope, and Charity.

A material thing can cause Spiritual Grace.

What Disposition is necessary.

C H A P. VII.

*How differently VVe and Sectaries proceed
in this Controversy. VVhat they
are to Prove.*

Other Ob-
jections
briefly
touch'd on.

The Fa-
thers say
nowhere,
that the
Sacrament
is a Sign
or Figure
only of
Christ.

S. Austin
affirms it
not.

I. **S**ome other Slight Objections yet remain Drawn from Fathers Misinterpreted, and the weak Reason of Sectaries. It is not worth the while, to Bring all to Light Again, They are Solved, and Undenially Solved, by our Catholick Writers. A few shall here suffice. Some Fathers seem to say, That this Sacrament is a *Sign*, a *Figure*, an *Image*, a *Type* of *Christ's* Body. Very true. But not one say's it is a *Sign* Only, a *Figure* Only, a *Memorial* Only &c. Now know. It is one Thing to call it a *Sign*, and an Other a *Sign* Only, Exclusive of *Christ's* Real Presence, As it is One Thing to say, Faith Justifies, And Faith *only* Justifies, excluding Charity. Read therefore Those words of S. Austin Lib. contra Adimantum cap. 12. Till your Eyes be Weary. *Non dubitavi dicere* &c. Our Lord Doubted not to say. *This is my Body, Cum daret signum Corporis sui*, When He gave a Sign of his Body. All you can Force out of Them, is this Obvious and Genuine Sense. Our Lord, When He gave His Disciples the Consecrated *Species*, *Accidents*, or *Forms* of Bread, which were a *sign*, and *Figure* of his Body There contained; Doubted not to Say, That, that which He then

then gave them under those *species*, was Really His Body. If Sectaries can Inforce more out of the Words; let them do it without Fancy, And prove their Gloss, by a Clearer *Principle* than *S^t. Austins* Words are.

2. Again. When some Fathers Say, There is not, *Planè idem corpus*, The same Body *Altogether* in the Eucharist, which was Fastned to the Cross, But after a *Manner the same*; To which Sense *S^t. Austin* Commenting in *Psalmum* 98. Introduceth our Saviour speaking thus. *Non hoc corpus quod videtis, manducaturi estis &c.* You are not to eat this Body you se (Grossly He Means, as the Capharnaits Understood) And to Drink that Blood, which my Enemies will Poure Out: I have Commended to you a *sacrament*, which *spiritually* Understood, will Give you Life &c. When, I say, The Fathers Express Themselves by such Terms, And Did so, As well to Remove from us all *Thick* and *Carnal Conceptions of this sublime Mystery*, as to Beget in us (so far as we can reach to) a Right understanding of the *spiritual Manner*, of *Christ* Existing in the Sacrament We must Distinguish, with the Apostle 1. Cor. 15. Two States of a Body, *Natural*, and *spiritual*, Whose *Dotts* and *Qualities*, Though Different, Change not the Body *Substantially*. Distinguish I say Thus, And then Speak boldly with the Fathers. It is not *Altogether* the same Body, But after a Manner; For, so we Speak in a Vsual Language, When we se one *Notably* Altered from Himself by Age or Sicknes, And say, He is not the *same* He was, But quite an Other. Man, Yet the Difference Here is not so Great as between a *Glorified* Body in Heavh, and a *Mortal* Body on Earth, or, Be-

What the Fathers mean, when They say it is not altogether the same Body.

The Fathers endeavour, to remove from us all gross Conceptions of this myste-

The two states of a Body, Natural, and spiritual, change not the substance of the Body.

We say usually when one is changed by Age or Sicknes, he is not the same man

308 Disc. IV. C. VII. *Catholicks and Sectaries*

twixt *Christ Body* *Siually* Extended with its just *Dimensions*, And not at all *Extended*. The Fathers Therfore, By placing all the Variety on the *Mode* or *Manner* of Existing, Deny not *Christs* real *Being* in this Sacrament, But as *Learnedly*, as *Literally* Express the very *Mystery*, as it ought to be Expressed. And We Stand to Their plain Words without Violence offered to the *Obvious Sense*, by any Superaddition of Far fetcht Glosses, Yet Say it is *Substantially the same Body*.

The Fa-
thers
Learnedly
and Lite-
rally Ex-
press the
Mystery.

3. And here by the way, if you will Parallel a little the Procedure of Sectaries with ours, And Ours with Theirs, As well in this as in Other Controversies, You may see How Faintly Fancy plead's against Reason, and Heresy Opposeth Truth. Observe it, What ever They Allege out of Gods Word for their Errour, VVe stand to the *Plain, Obvious*, and *Literal* Sense of the Text, And yet Deny Their Heresy Drawn from it, Which therefore must of Necessity be an Additional Gloss of Fancy. For Example. Doth Scripture say, *Do this in Remembrance of me*? We admit of the Open Sense of the Words, without further Commentaries; or Glosses. Doth it say *The Flesh Profit's Nothing*? We say so too, But must learn, by other Principles, what *Flesh Signifies* in that Place. Doth it say, That *All the Ancient Hebrewes eat of the same Bread, Drank of the same Water*? We, without Wresting the Text say so too. Dot it say, *that God Inhabits not Temples made by Hands*? So say We, And Give this Reason, Because Gods Divinity infinitely *Immense, Circumscribed in no Particular Place* (as if he wanted Lodging) is *Every Where*. Doth it say that *Christ Risen from the Dead*, was not Therefore in the Sepulchre? We Answer, the *Illation* is good
in

Catholicks
Stand to the
plain ob-
vious sense
of their
words, and
Scripture
also.

Examples
Hereof.

in those Circumstances, whilst Those virtuous Women Sought the Living Among the Dead. Do the Fathers say that the Holy Sacrament of the Altar is a Sign, a Figure, a Type of Christ even There Present? We Acquiesce, and speak also as They Do, But with-
No Father makes the Sacrament a Sign, a Figure only, excluding Christ's presence.
 all Add, That no Father makes it a Sign, a Figure, a Memorial Only, as if the Reality of his Body were Exclud-
ing Christ's presence.
 ed from the Outward Species of Bread and Vine. Thus we Proceed with all Candor.

4. Now let us cast a few Thoughts upon our Secta-
Sectaries
 ries Dealing with us Catholicks, And See how Fancy
 only Uphold's every Thing they Assert. We Allege
 our saviours own Words. *This is my Body* which is
contrary- wise pro- ceed with Catholicks, and violently force both Scripture and Fathers.
 Given for you. They Answer, No. It was not
 his Body, but a Sign Only of His Body Given for us.
Examples Hereof,
 Observe well. This Interpretation of a Sign Only, is a
 Gloss of Fancy. For, neither the Word, Sign, is in
 Scripture, Nor a Sign Only is any Ancient Father. We
 Cite Again that Unanswerable Text of S. Luke. *This*
is the Chalice, the new Testament in my Blood, which Chal- cere is shed for you.
 And mark the word *exponitur*, that
 Relates to *verbiis* of the same Case, and not to *disparis* of
 a Different Case. What Answer our Sectaries. Mar-
 ry Beza Tell's us S. Luke Here, either spak a Solacism,
 or a Marginal Note Cre'pt by chance into the Text;
 Here is His best Solution, And who Tell's Mr. Beza so,
 But his own Fancy? We Produce moreover Those
 Testimonies of Ancient Fathers, Briefly Hinted at Abo-
 ve, And say no Wit of Man can solve Them, Chiefly
 That Authority of S. Cyril, Of *Vine changed into Blood, as*
Water was Once changed into Vine. They Answer. The
 Change was only Moral of Wine Deputed to a Holy
 Use,

Use, which is Against the very *Nature* of the Instance, And consequently a Strong Thought of Fancy. We say No Universal Tradition, No Ancient Church, ever Opposed the Doctrin of the Roman Catholick Church concerning this Mystery. Herein, our Adversaries are Silenced, And cannot Design the Orthodox Church that opposed our Doctrin, as both We, and the whole world beside, now oppose their Novelty. Parallel therefore the Proceedings of Sectaries Against us, with ours Against them, And you will find them to stand upon Quicksand, without Principles: The very Straits They are put to, Demonstrate this Evidently, whilst, as you have seen, They *Mangle, Pervert, Misconstrue*, and *Gloss* Every clear Authority cited against Them, And We on the other side, candidly Admit both of Scripture and Fathers Quoted by Them, without Any other Gloss but what the very Text, and Context of the Testimonies Allow of.

A Parallel between their Proceeding and ours. Sectaries mangle and pervert most clear Authorities.

Sectaries bold in asserting, but weak at their Proofs.

What our Catholic Proofs are.

Sectaries cannot deny Them.

5. And Hence it is, that you Always have our Adversaries *bold* in Asserting, But *Cold, Unmanly, and Weak* at their Proofs. Besides what is now said, the true Reason is. No Proof can touch, much less Vainquish a Verity, that Stands firm upon undeniable Principles. Plain Scripture, the *Unanimous Consent of Fathers*, undeniable Tradition, the Authority of a Holy and Universal Church, and this *Negative*, *No Church ever blamed our Doctrin* are Strong Supports for the Faith we Profess. And can our Sectaries, who are as *Scriptureless*, as *Fatherless*, as *Fatherless* as *Churchless*, and Finally Destitute of All other Principles, Think to Dant us with a few *Gleanings*, Gathered now out of This, now out of that Ancient Writer, when They Evidently see with their Eyes the whole

le Torrent of Antiquity contrary to Them? Can they
 Perswade Themselves, that Because one *Theodoret* For ex-
 ample Saith, the *Mystical Signs after the Sanctification, Re-*
cede not from Their Nature, but Remain in their first Sub-
stance, Figure, and Form, are Seen, and Touched as
 Before (which words are literally True, if we Speak, as
 this Author Doth, of the *visible Accidents* of Bread and
 Wine) Can we, I say, Think that this one Authority,
 Though it were a Hundred times more Difficil, Hath
 Weight enough to turn the Scales, Force Enough to
 Drive us from the Faith, which Scripture, Church,
 and Fathers most manifestly Deliver? It is impossi-
 ble. All know, when Divines Explicate Scripture
 or Fathers, They Interpret the obscurer Passage by the
 Clearer, And never make the Darker Place to give Light
 to the more Evident. Observe Now. *Theodoret*
 saith the *Mystical Signs Recede not from their Nature*,
 But Remain as before. I say so too. The only
 Difficulty is what he Meanes by the Word *Signs*, and
Nature? Sectaries Tell us: The Sense is. Bread
 and wine Recede not from Their True Substance. First,
 This is their Gloss without Proof; For, the *visible Signs*
 of bread and wine, are not the *Invisible Substance* of
 Bread and Wine. 2. *Theodoret* in all law of Arguing,
 when His plain Words Force not on us this sense of Se-
 ctaries, ought to be Catholickly Interpreted: And Had
 we no other Reason but this, That it cannot be Reason,
 To make so Learned a Father (Though once he stray'd
 a little) to Clash with all Antiquity, it were Enough.
 At most His Words are Doubtful, And, upon that
 Account capable of Explication, is it not Therefore mo-
 re Just, to Explicate Them by the Clear and *Vindicia-*
ble *signs*.

Of Theo-
dorets
Authority.

We Admis
of his
Words.

The obscu-
rer places
of Scriptu-
re, and Fa-
thers, are to
be Inter-
preted by
the clearer.

Sectarists
Glosses
without
Proof.

Theodo-
ret cannot
be suppo-
sed to con-
tradict
other most
Learned
Fathers.
He is to be
Explicated
where he ob-
scure, by the
sense of o-
ther Fa-
thers.

512. Disc. IV. CVII. *Catholicks and Sectaries*

ble Doctrin of a whole Church, And other Fathers, then to Draw these Fathers from their Open and Manifest Sense to His, if it be supposed Obscure (as in Truth, well Pondered, it is not. Let Reason Judge Here.

Sectaries want Principles.

6. By what is said Already, We may well pity the desperate Condition of Sectaries, who Pertinaciously Defend an Heresy, without so much as a colour of Scripture, Church, or the General Consent of Fathers; For, these Principles (and none can Parallel them) Most evidently Fail our Adversaries. Urge them Again and Again to speak more Pertinently to their Cause, then is Don hitherto: You get nothing but the Old Story told over again, And it will never be Better, for I se too Plainly Their Humor. It is, God knows, To spend, or rather to Mispend their whole Life and Labour in Trifles. They Think, to Cavil at the Proofs of our Doctrin Establisheth Theirs; As if it were sufficient, to make their Novelty good, Because they can Talk against our Ancient Faith, Just as if One, to Prove Himself an Honest Man, might do it Pithily, by calling his Neighbour a Knave.

Sectaries Trifling, and when in it Appear's.

Solid Proofs for a Doctrin stand firm and unshaken against all Opponents.

7. I must yet Add one Significant Word more, And 'Tis very Necessary to lay forth our Adversaries Weaknes, as well in This as in All other Controversies. Observe it. *When Proofs of a Doctrin stand on solid Grounds, and Principles*, the Objections Against it are like Fathers cast Against the Wind, forceles, And return upon the Opponents to their Confusion, wherof, I think, you Have Already seen Enough in this Present Controversy. But contrarywise. When the Proofs are *Meagre, Barren, and Void of Strength* (They are ever so with Sectaries) The Very Opposite Principles for Truth, *Dash*

Dash All, Discountenance All; and Evidently Shew those Arguments to be Feeble. And Truly, would our Adversaries once Deal Ingeniously, Candor would Force them to Acknowledge what I say to be most True; when they can allege nothing probably for their Novelty against our Plain Scripture, Against the Ancient Doctrin of a Vniversal Learned Church, And the Authority of so many Fathers now Cited.

Did So. Heres Proceed Candidly, They would se Themselves Convinced.

8. We might yet entertain you with One or Two Difficulties more Drawn from Reason, Wherat our Adversaries, Measuring Gods Power by their own Wit or Fancy Stumble not a Little. One is: A Body cannot be in two Places at Once. Just so the Peasant Thinks the sun cannot be bigger then a Broad Sieve, Because (never learning Mathematiks) He Measures All by his silly Imagination; And so the Sectary Doth Here, Because He is no Scholler in *Christs* School. But *ad Rem.* Who Tell's Him that a Body cannot be in two Places at once? *Hath God Revealed this in Scripture?* No, But Philosophy Teaches it: What Philosophy? *Aristotles?* No, For the Received Doctrin of his School is, That a Body (to say nothing of a Soule That is in two places, Head and Feet at Once) Individually Considered by it Self, is no more Actually Its own Local Presence or Place Then the Organ of the Eye is of it Self its own Actual Vision, Or Fire by it self Actually Heat. This is common Philosophy, if That of Sectaries be Better, let them Vouchsafe to Learn us Otherwise, Not by Saying it is Better, But by some Clear and Vndeniable Principle.

Difficulties drawn from the weak Reason of Sectaries solved.

Nisaber Faith nor Philosophy, against the being of a Body in two places.

A Body is not by it self, its own local presence.

An other Argument of Sectaries ungrounded.

9. An other Argument is Drawn from the Great Indignities, wherunto *Christs* Sacred Body is lyable, if it

be in the Holy Sacrament : As That a Mouſe , or Wors Creature may Eat it Vp &c. Here we may Juſtly Exclame with *S. Auſtin* upon another Occaſion *lib. 22. de Ciuis. c. 11. Ecce qualibus argumentis Omnipotentie Dei humana contradicit infirmitas &c.* Se, with what Slight Arguments Mans weak Wit Oppoſeth Gods Omnipotency . . . Speak therfore Truth. Is it not a grea-

The pre-
tended in-
dignities of
Sectaries
ſhewed
Trivious.

ter Indignity, that *Chriſt* Permitt's a Sinner to Receive him with a filthy conſcience, Then That He lies in the Stomach of a Rat or Mouſe? Say yet. Had a worm Suk't his Precious Blood when it was ſhed on the Ground in his Paſſion, or, a Spider bit his Sacred fleſh in the Crib of Bethlem, Would that Indignity, think ye, Have Forced men from a Belief of *his Real true Body*? Theſe are childiſh Arguments, not worth the Anſwering. And here you have almoſt an End of a *Digeſſion* which I Think cannot be well Anſwered.

Some points
Briefly
touch'd on,
whereunto
Sollaries
are deſired
to Anſwer.

10. I Exceed not in ſaying : *It cannot be Anſwered*. And therfore Tell our Adverſaries, if it ſhall pleaſe them to Reply They are firſt to Prove, and by *certain Principle*, that *Chriſts* Sacred Words now Alleged for our Catholick Verity are *Miſunderſtood* by us, And ought to have *Their Determinate ſenſe* of a *Sign, Figure, Metonymy*, and no Other. What we here Require is moſt Reaſonable; For, if my Faith fall upon Their ſenſe They are obliged to Prove it *Revealed by Almighty God*, Otherwiſe Contrary to all Reaſon They'l Vrge me to Believe what an infinit Verity never Spak. 2. They are to Prove And by a clear Principle alſo, That in ſuch an Age after *Chriſt*, There was an Orthodox Church that *Believed their Doctrin* of a *Sign, Figure, Metonymy Only &c.*

Upon ſound
Principles.

And

And Publicly Opposed ours of Christs Real Presence in the Eucharist. To do this, More is required then to cite a few broken Sentences of Fathers, half *Abused* and *Wholly* weighed out of Their Circumstances. All which put together Come not neer to a Probable, much less, to a Certain Principle That's able to Evert the undeniable clear Catholick Doctrin of other Fathers; And the Authority of our whole learned Church with Them. 3. They are not only to Interpret the Fathers now Alleged (For, Fancy without Proof may pervert the clearest Words God ever Spak) But, when Their Interpretation is made They must Shew it grounded upon a *contrary Received Principle* as Strong, as the Express Words of those Fathers are. 4. They are to Show, That Christ our Lord when He uttered those sacred words to His Disciples. *This is my Body*, And then foresaw the universal supposed Errour of Believing his Real Presence in the Eucharist would follow in all Orthodox Churches, And from no other Cause but His own Express and significant Speaking, They are, I say, Obliged to Prove And by an undeniable Principle, *that He shut up in the clearest Proposition He ever uttered, that Dark sense which They draw from it*, And, that He did so to Deceive the World. *Secdaries* grant Christians to have been universally Deceived in their Belief of the Real Presence: And that the supposed Errour Arose from Christs plain words, is Evident. For, *the whole Catholick Church that Believes this Mystery doth so, Because Truth is self said plainly without Reserve: This is my Body.* Finally, That Christ our Lord would speak as He did is Manifest by the Gospel; And that He then foresaw the *supposed Universal Errour*, would be also Believed by force of His words in the greatest

Maimed Sentences of Fathers, Proofs.

When Secdaries Interpret the Fathers, They are obliged to prove their Interpretation.

What Secdaries Grant.

part of Christendom is most Vndubitable, Because of the perfect Knowledge He had of *Future Things*.
 §. May it please Sectaries to Proceed candidly, They are to cast a serious Reflection on pass't Ages and Ponder well, who those were that Patronized *Their Doctrin, and Opposed ours*. They are to compare and justly to Ballance *their Obscure Scripture with our clear Texts* : *The weak Testimonies* of Their misconstrued Fathers, with our contrary now Quoted Authorities ; Their *Novelty* with our *Ancient Believed Faith*, The sentiment of their *little late Congregation* concerning this Mystery with the Judgement and Belief of *our long standing Roman Church &c.* And, if when All is Don, They can come to a sound Principle Wherby it may Appear to every Rational man, That their *Scripture, Fathers, and Church Authority* Outweigh as it were Ours Or have more force to establish their Novelty, then what is now Alleged to make our Catholick Doctrin most stably sure ; We will begin to Think They may more laudably write Controversies Hereafter. But if contrarywise, you find Them Gravelled at every Difficulty now Proposed, and hear nothing distinctly Replied to (*upon undoubted Principles*) or Further confuted, then a loos wandring Discours will carry on a Weak Cause, I'll once more crave Their Pardon, and Plainly Say : *Our Arguments and Reasons cannot be Answered.*

C H A P. VIII.

*The Conclusion. The Churches
Evidence.*

F. WE have seen Enough in the Precedent Dis-
 courses That True Religion is not (as Se-
 ctaries make Protestantcy) Like a Dark Lanthorn, But
 One of the most Morally Manifested and Evidenced
 Things in the World : And Reason Teaches it should
 be so. For, if *true Worth* ever Shewes it self by *Real True worth*
Signs and Known Effects: (So Faith is Discovered by *is Known*
good Works, Life by its Vital Operations, The Existency *by real Ef-*
of a Deity by the Emanations of Creatures) None can *fects.*
 Doubt; But That God who Desires all to be Saved,
 Hath Made That Religion wherein Salvation is Had, *Proofs can-*
 most Known and Discernable by Outward Signs and *not be*
 Vndubitable Marks of Truth. Therefore, as we said *wanting to*
 above, clear Proofs cannot be Wanting Wherby That *manifest*
 is Manifested which God *will have Known.* *Audistis* *Church;*
ejus vocem manifestissimam. They are Words of St. Au- *wherin*
 stin de Vnis. *Ecclesia* cap. 25. You have Heard the Most *Salvation*
 Manifest Voyce of God, *Not only by the Law, Prophets* *is to be*
and Psalms, But by His Own Sacred Mouth *Commendantis* *had.*
Ecclesiam suam futuram. Commending his Future Church *St. Austin*
 to us All. *This Church you have Diffused Every where:* *confirm's*
 You see it like a Citty, wherof He who Built it, Saith : *this Do-*
Citty upon a Mountain, cannot be Hid. This is the Church *ctrine.*

T t t 3

which

which is not in one Part of the World, as the Donatists were in the South, And our Sectaries now are in These Northern Climates, *sed ubique est notissima*, But 'tis Manifest every where. And, if you Ask by what Signs it is Known? The Saint Answers, *lib. de Utilit. Cred.*

And shew-
es, by what
Marks
Christ's
Church is
Evidenced.

St. Austins
Motives of
Credibility.

c. 17. *Hoc factum est Divina Providentiâ*. This is Done by Providence, By the Oracles and Fore telling of Prophets, by the Humanity and Doctrin of Christ, by the wearisome Travails of his Apostles, by the Reproaches and Contumelies of Martyrs, by their Gibbets Blood shedding and Blessed Deaths, By the Famous Known Lives of saints, and Among These so Universal great Virtues, By most Worthy Miracles, Meely and upon fit Occasion shewed us. Mark the Signs. He Goes on.

Cum igitur tantum Auxilium &c. When Therefore we see so great Ayde and Help Afforded by Almighty God, so much Fruit and Entcrease. *Dubitamus nos ejus Ecclesia gremio condere &c.* Shall we Doubt to Hide our Selves in the Lap of That Church which from the Apostolical Sea, Even to this Publick Confession of Mankind, Hath got to such a Height of Authority, by a Continual Succession of Bishops; condemned Hereticks vainly Snarling at it. Partly also by the Iudgement of the People, Partly by the Gravity and Weight of Councils, Partly by the Glory and Majesty of Miracles. *Cui nolle primas dare, vel summa profecto impietatis est, vel precipitiis arrogantia.*

They force
Reason to
profess the
Faith of
that
Church,
which
shewes
them.

It is pride
and impiety,
not to
give Pre-
eminence
to such a
Church be-
fore others.
St. Austin
Defends
not a Reli-
gion com-
mon to all
Christians.

And not to Give to this Church the Chiefest Preeminence is in Good Earnest, either a Mighty Wickednes, or a Stubborn and Headstrong Pride. Ponder these Words well with the Following Also, and Ask your Own Consciences, what Church that was For Which St. Austin Pleaded so Strongly? Did He Speak For All who Go under the Name of Christians? No: The Impugned Manichies were Such, And so we

re

re also the *Arians, Pelagians, and Others*: But These Because of Their Vnevidenced Religion (utterly Destitute of Marks and Motives) He Rejects as Schismatics and Hereticks. Did He Argue, Think ye, For our little late Risen Congregation of Protestants? No God Knows, They have less of this Evidence Then the very Arians Had; And, Besides were never Thought of in *S^t. Austins* Dayes. *

Much less, the Then unknown Novelities of Protestants,

2. The Church Therefore, For which our Profound Doctor Speak's and Plead's, is an Other Society Known to the World before Heresy Began. *I Mean the Ever Visible, Holy, Continued and Catholick Roman Church. When into Heresy, justly condemned, never Entered.* (*August. Tract. 18. in Ioannem*) And, whereof the Prophets Spak more significantly then of Christ Himself (*Aug. in Psal. 30.*) This Church, And this Only, Hath been Manifested Age after Age by Eminent Sanctity, By Glorious Miracles, By the Bloodshedding of Martyrs; By a never Interrupted Succession of Prelates, Pastors, and People from *S^t. Peters* Dayes to Ours, And finally By most Learned and Approved Councils. This, and This Only is the Church Diffused the Whole World Over, which Keeps perfect Unity in Faith with one Supream Head, And so Demonstratively Evidenceth its Antiquity, That the Worst of Sectaries are silenced When They offer to Cavil at it.

The Saints plead's for no other, then for the Ever Visible, Holy, and Catholick Roman Church,

Made Evidently Credible, by undoubted Marks and Signs.

3. If you Ponder well These Vndeniable Truths, You must needs Conclude Against Sectaries, as Blessed *S^t. Austin* Once did Against the *Manicheans*. Read him *lib. de util. creden. cap. 14.* VOS AUTEM TAM PAUCI, ET TAM TURBULENTI, ET TAM NOVI, NEMINI DUBIUM EST, QUIN NIHIL DIGNUM AUTHORITATE PRÆFERATIS. There is no

A Conclusion against Sectaries.

Doubr,

St. Austins
pithy Ex-
pression,
justly a-
grees to Se-
ctaries,
Th. y are
few in
number,
Famously
Divided.
And of a
new Faith,
St Austins
words pon-
dered with
Reflection
on Secta-
ries.
Innumera-
ble witness-
es against
a few.

Many
stands a-
gainst Di-
vision.

Doubt, Saith the Saint, But that You Sectaries so meanly Few, who Evidence nothing Credible in your Religion, You so *Turbulent* and *Confused* in your Opinions concerning Faith; You so newly *Strangers* to the Christian World; There is, I say, no Doubt But That You of so Small Authority can Allege Nothing worth the Hearing, or *Worthy of Credit* when you Oppugn our Ancient Church, or Defend Your Own so late invented Novelties. Consider every Word Seriously.

VOS TAM PAUCI. What? You so Few. You, Who Se, to Your Eternal Discomfort, so Many Nations, so many People, so Many *Worthy Prelates*, so Many *Glorious Martyrs*, so Many *Penitent Sinners* Believing Our Ancient Faith Dying in it, and for it: You, who se so Many *Miracles* Confirm it, so Many *Conversions* Wrought by it, so Many *Churches* Erected, so many *Universities Founded*, so Many *Prisons Sanctified*, so Many *Dangers* run Through, so Many *works* of Piety Don by the *Professours* of this Ancient Church: All is Evident to Your Eyes and Senses: VOS AUTEM TAM PAUCI.

And what can You so *Inconsiderably Few*, not the Hundred part in Number, who Have Don Nothing like these Zelous Christians Say for a *Novelty*, or Probably Plead Against so Learned, so Holy and so Diffused a Christian Society? Moreover. VOS TAM TURBULENTI. You so *Turbulent*, Se in This Ample Moral Catholick Body Innumerable Seculars, Though of Different Nations, of Different Tempers and Education, *Knit Together* in One Ancient Belief: You Se Innumerable Profound Doctors, All over Christianity, Innumerable Learned Religious, (Though Various in Matters meerly Opinative) Yet so Highly Tender of the

Churches

Churches *Unite*, That They would rather Dy then *Break or Blemish it*. All these well Agreeing Harts in one Faith, *Evidence*, That This Church, is Made up of Members who Glory in Vnion *amongst Themselves*, and Testify it By a due Submission to one *Supream Head* set over this Blessed Society: *VOſ AVTEM TAM TURBULENTI*. And what can You, late *Troublesome* People, Who Yeild Submission to None, But to your *own Fancies*, You, Who within the Compass of one Narrow Kingdom, are so turbulently Divided in Faith, so Horridly Rent and Torn a Pieces with *Schism*; What can You, I say, Allege For Your Breach of Vnion, or Rationally Pretend Against this long Standing and Ancient *Agreeing Body* of Catholicks?

4. Finally. You So NEW MEN Behold (And it may lay Sorrow at your Harts) Innumerable of your own long since Deceased Ancestors, Professed Children of this *Mother Church*, Their Monuments, *Even in England* (Sad Spectacles 'Tis true, But) Visible Enough to Your Eyes, Plead Strongly for the Ancient Faith, which You now Vnfortunately Reject: You Se, The Very Churches built by Those your Fore-fathers, Though in *part Defaced*, Are not yet so much Spoiled, But, That still a memory is preserved of Catholick Religion in the very Altars half Pulled Down, In the Crosses, And other *Remembrances* of their Ancient Renowned Piety: You Se withall, Whole Volumes writ in Defense of our Catholick Doctrin, the very Velume and Characters wherof (much elder then your Faith) lament your late Change, And tell many a sad Story of your new risen Gospel. *VOſ ERGO TAM NOVĪ, And How Dare you so late Masters,* without Confusion and Torment

*Antiquity
against
Novelty.*

V u u

ment

ment of Conscience, reflect on These *Ancestors*, Look on These *Monuments*, Read these *Writings*, And after all, Speak, as you do Irreverently of an *Ancient Faith*, meerly to Countenance a *Novelty* Wherof the World never Heard, before you Preach't it. Say once Plainly, 'Tis High time to Speak, what Have you for This Protestancy? Any *Prudent Motives* That make it Credible? Not One. Have you *Scripture*? Not a Word. Do *Ancient Councils*, or, the *Unanimous Consent* of Fathers Favour it? No. All Band against it, And leave both you, and the Novelty professed by you To no better a Ground, then what Vphold's all *Heresy*, which is *Fancy*, or some Thing wors then *Fancy*. Therefore. *Nemini dubium est quin nihil dignum auctoritate praeferatis.*

Nothing
can defend
Protestancy
but Fancy

5. Some Perhaps will say. If Protestancy be thus Highly Improbable, And the Roman Catholick Religion so *Manifestly Credible* As is now Declared, From Whence is it That *Sectaries* Stay so long in *Heresy*, And Embrace not a Faith, which is without *Dispute* undoubtedly Clear to All? To Answer the Question, it would be enough to Propose an Other, And 'Tis not to Ask, Why All Embrace not Protestancy That hath Nothing to induce men to it, But Why, after All those most *signal Manifest Miracles*, and *Conversions* wrought by *Christ* our Lord and His Apostles the whole world, Both Jewes and Gentils came not Then in, Vpon such *Evident Motives*, Why Did they not Forthwith Profess Christianity? Most Certainly the Attraction was Forceable: They wanted no Inducements. But Education And a contrary custom of Living Hindred much, and Sense too strong with the Most of men,

Why *Sectaries* stay so long in *Heresy*, whilst the Church is so manifest to all.

It is Answered first, by an Instance of *Christ* and his Apostles not converting all, A further Reason is Given,

524 Disc. IV. C. VIII. *The Conclusion.*

numerable Missioners Up and Down the World, And yet Gives you Plenty of painfull Preachers in the Church, who Cease not to Speak in Gods Cause, *Et omne os obstruatur*, that the Mouths of Sectaries being Stopped, All may love Truth and Yeild a Due Submission to Christ and His Church. You se Therefore How Heresy,

And more,
then is
Vulgarly
conceived.

Though it Poysons Him That Feed's on't, Yet it causeth More Good Among Christians, Then our Vulgar Thoughts easily reach to. *Se Tertullian lib. de Praesc.* c. 1. And *S. Auslin de Verd Relig.* c. 8.

God
That per-
mits'sin
and Here-
sy, knowes
best for
what use
they serve.

7. Grow not Therefore Angry with God ('Tis *ter-
tullians* advise) for Permitting Sin and Heresy. An *Infinis* Wisdom. Knowes best for what Use they Serve. You Remember, When Those Servants in the Gospel *Matth. 13. 26.* Saw cockle Appearing among the Wheat, They readily Offred their Service to Pluck it Vp, But the wise Housholder said, No. *Sinite utraque crescere us-
que ad messem.* Suffer Both to Grow until the Harvest, And in the time of Harvest, I will say to the Reapers, Gather up first the cockle &c. They Pressed not further, but Remained well Satisfied with Christs Answer.

Christs
Answer.

Least whilst you Gather up the Tares you Root up also the wheat with Them. Now, if you Vnderstand not the Deep Sense of these sacred Words :

The Apost-
les pious
exclama-
tion.
The Pro-
phets Les-
son, and
the wise
Counsell,
of the son
of Syrach.

Exclaim with the Apost-
le *Rom. 11. 33.* O Altitudo. O Depth of the Riches, of the Wisdom and Knowledge of God! *Quis cognovit sensum Domini*, Who hath known the mind of our Lord, or, who hath been his Counsellor? Learn well that good Lesson : *Esay 55. 9.* My Thoughts are not your Thoughts, for as the Heavens are Exalted above the Earth, so are my Wayes Exalted above Yours, and my Cogitations above your Cogitations. Learn more of J E S U, the Wise son of

Disc. IV. C. VIII. *The Churches Evidence.* 525

of *Syrach Eccles. 33. 15.* And Look with Him, upon all the Works of the Highest. *You se Two against Two, and One Against One, Against Evil is Good, Against Death is Life, Against a Lust man is a Sinner, And I Add, Against Truth you have Heresy.* *S. Austin lib. II. de Civitate c. 18.* Call's these Things, *Rerum Antitheta*. Contrarities in the works of God, And moreover Assures us, That His Goodnes would never have Created either Men or Angels in whom Evil was *Foreseen, Nisi pariter nosset, quibus eos Bonorum usibus accommodaret*, unless He had also Known how Useful, Subservient, and Beneficial, I'll would Prove at last, to Vertuous Good Men. *Atque ita in ordinem seculorum tanquam pulcherrimum Carmen, etiam ex quibusdam quasi Antithetis honestaret*, And How that in the Cours of Ages, He might Commend and set Forth all We se, like a well made Vers with certain Contrarities. Evil Therefore Hath its Good, and Gives a Grace to Virtue. Errour Add's a Comeliness to Truth, And the more Ugly Heresy is, the More it Sett's forth the Lustre of christ's Orthodox Church, And makes it glorious. *Pictor novit* (They are Words of *S. Austin serm. De Diversis c. 5. fine*) *ubi ponas nigrum colorem ut sis decora pictura, & nescis Deus ubi ponas peccatores, ut sis ordinata creatura.* A Painter Knowes well where to lay Darker Colours, That his Piece may be Fair to the eye, And Shall not God Know where to Place Sinners (the like is of Hereticks) That His Creatures may Therby Appear seemly, and in Order? Yes most Assuredly. This great Doctor saith yet More *lib. de Vera Religione c. 6. Hac enim catholica Ecclesia, per totum orbem valide lateque diffusa, omnibus errantibus ad profectus suos, & ad eorum Correctio-*

Teach us to Revere Gods permission of Evil.

S. Austins Discours, of Contrarities in Gods works.

Evil graceeth virtus and Errour gives a lustre to Truth.

S. Austin confirm's the Doctrine.

And shew's us of what use erring men are to the Church.

526 Disc. IV. C. VIII. The Conclusion.

nem cum Evigilare voluerint &c. This Catholick Church so far and neer Diffused, makes Benefit of all Poor erring Souls, Yea, and Doth so for their *Amendments*, when They Shall Please to Awake out of their Drowlines. It makes Use of Gentils to let them Se the Wonders it Works, of Hereticks to Prove its Holy Doctrin, of Schismaticks to give them a Lesson of better stability, of Iewes to shew them the Beauty of Christian Religion &c. So it is. All the Blindnes in the world, saith *s. Austin*, els Were, *Ad aliquem usum sanctorum ordinatur*, is Ordained for some Profit and Service, of Gods Elect and Chosen People.

Hereby serviceable to the Church,

8. Conclude therefore. As there will be Deluded Souls, whether Iewes or Gentils: As There will be Sin, Oppression, and Open Injustice to the End of Ages. *Sic oportet Hareses esse.* So there will be Heresies also, And Those who Wilfully Shut their Eyes to the Evidence of a Glorious Mother Church. And wonder not at it. For you Know, That the Son of God Himself, came into the World, *Et mundus eum non cognovit*, And the World would not know Him, His sacred Doctrin was Preach't All over, But Seemed, *Judaici scandalum, Gentibus stultitia*, A Scandal to the Iewes, and a Foolery to the Gentils. What Marvel is it then, that His Own Holy Church, Be less Regarded by Dispirited Souls, and the Doctrin thereof set Light by? Have Patience. Wait on Gods Good Leisure. No Hart is so Hard but Grace can Soften it. These Dimm Eyes of Deceived Men Will at last be Opened. *Et videbis omnis caro Salutare Dei.* And all shall Se and Know, That, as There is no Other Saviour but One,

No wonder that some wilfully Shut their Eyes to the Evidence of the Church,

When the Son of God was not known to all,

Disc.IV.C.VIII. *The Churches Evidence.* 327

One, Christ our Lord, So There is no other Church but
 One, Wherein salvation (long Sought for) can be Found,
 But in the One only Ancient, Apostolical, Catholick, and
 Holy Roman Church. CREDO SANCTAM ECCLESIAM CA-
 THOLICAM.

No other
 Christ but
 one, No
 other
 Church but
 the one only
 Roman
 Catholick
 Church.

F I N I S.



THE

THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER.

528

- CHAP. IX. *A short Digression concerning the shuffling of Protestants in this matter.* 188
- CHAP. X. *Protestants have no rational Motives, whereby their new Faith is evidenced to be so much as Probable.* 96
- CHAP. XI. *Arguments drawn from Reason against Protestants, upon the consideration of These declared Motives.* 114
- CHAP. XII. *Protestants, for want of rational Motives cannot convert an Infidel to Christian Faith.* 119
- CHAP. XIII. *Protestancy for want of Rational Motives dishonors Christ, and makes way for any new coyned Heresy.* 128

THE SECOND DISCOVERS.

Of Scripture.

- CHAP. I. *Scripture is useless, if none declare infallibly the sense of it.* 135
- CHAP. II. *The Fallacy of Protestants concerning Scripture, and the Interpretation of Scripture, is discovered.* 144
- CHAP. III. *All substantials of Faith are not plain in Scripture without an infallible Teacher.* 153
- CHAP. IV. *Sole Scripture without an infallible Interpreter can be no Rule of Faith. Protestants have no Scripture for their Religion, as it is Protestant.* 162
- CHAP. V. *The Reason of private men, and their private spirit, cannot interpret Scripture.* 169
- CHAP. VI. *The new mode of Protestants Misinterpreting Scripture, which proves the Churches Infallibility, is more Amply Refuted.* 179
- X x x
- CHAP.

THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER.

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| CHAP. VII. | More of this Subject. | 187 |
| CHAP. VIII. | The new Mode of Sectaries misinterpreting Scripture destroys Protestant Religion. | 195 |
| CHAP. IX. | Of the Means left by Almighty God to interpret Scripture Truly. One Passage more of Scripture Proving Infallible Teachers, is quoted. | 203 |
| CHAP. X. | Objections are Answered. | 217 |

THE THIRD DISCOVERS.

Of Sectaries Vnreasonable Proceeding.

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| C | HAP. I. Protestants are Vnreasonable, whilst They seemingly hold a Catholick Church Distinct from the Roman, neither known nor Designable by any. | 231 |
| CHAP. II. | Of a late Writers Doctrin. | 236 |
| CHAP. III. | The Pretended Reformation of Protestants is unreasonable; if Faith in Christ Only suffice for Salvation. A more Explicit Faith is proved Necessary. | 244 |
| CHAP. IV. | The Ambiguous Discourses of Protestants, concerning Fundamentals in Faith, are proved unreasonable. | 250 |
| CHAP. V. | An Answer to one Reply. More of this Subject. | 262 |
| CHAP. VI. | Some Few Propositions of a late Writer are briefly Examined. His Discours of Fundamentals Destroys Protestant Religion. | 271 |
| CHAP. VII. | More of this Subject. Objections are Answered. | 291 |
| CHAP. VIII. | Protestants are unreasonable in the Defense of Their | 291 |

THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER.

- Their late Manifest and undoubted Schism.* 315
 CHAP. IX. *Protestants cannot make Good Their Charge Against the Roman Catholick Church, concerning causal Schism.* 323
 CHAP. X. *The Roman Catholick Church, whilst Evidence comes not Against it, stands Firm upon its Ancient Possessed Rights. This long Possession Proves the Church Orthodox.* 333
 CHAP. XI. *Of a late Writers Exceptions Against our Pleading Possession.* 339
 CHAP. XII. *Another Objection. And whether protestants can Acquis themselves of Schism.* 357
 CHAP. XIII. *A second Argument Against this Schism. Of Sectaries Cavils concerning Errours, Entering the Church insensibly.* 362
 CHAP. XIV. *A Word to a Few supposed and improved Assertions. Wherby some Endeavour to clear Protestants of Schism.* 379
 CHAP. XV. *More of These Authors confused Doctrin, is Refused.* 387

THE FOVRTH DISCOVERS.

Of the Churches Evident Credibility. Of the Improbability of Protestancy.

CHAP. I. *Christs Church is Proved to be no Other, But the Roman Catholick. Sectaries are convinced of error.* 405

XX X 2

CHAP. II.

THE CHAPTERS IN ORDER.

- CHAP. II. *Preſtancy is an unevideſced, And a moſt improbable Religion, or, rather no Religion, but a meer Fancied Opinion.* 420
- CHAP. III. *A Word more of Seclaries new Mode of Arguing laid forth, by Touching on the Controverſy concerning the Doctrin of Purgatory.* 434
- CHAP. IV. *A Parallel of Proofs for, and againſt the Doctrin of Purgatory. A ſolution to a late Adverſaries Objections.* 452
- CHAP. V. *An objection propoſed, and ſolved in a Diſcourſ of another Controverſy. Which is the Real Preſence.* 477
- CHAP. VI. *Seclaries without either Proof or principles, wreſt Chriſts Words to an improper ſenſe, and rent an Hereſy upon meer Fancy.* 489
- CHAP. VII. *How differently We and Seclaries proceed in this Controverſy. What they are to Prove.* 506
- CHAP. VIII. *The Conclusion. The Churches Evidence.* 517

SOME

SOME FEW OF THE MORE CHIEF CONTENTS

530

OF THIS T R E A T I S E. THE FIRST DISCOVERS.

Of Infallible Teachers, and the Motives of Credibility.

Christs Church hath infallible Teachers of true Christian Religion, Christs infallible Doctrin requires infallible Teachers. A Doctrin that is fallible may be fals. Christ sent none to teach any other Doctrin but that which may be resolved into Gods certain Revelation, but such a Doctrin can neither be fals nor fallible. Sectaries preach no other Doctrin but what is fallible and may be fals. The Objective infallibility of Gods Word in Scripture is not *ex terminis* Evident, and no Church (as They say) Ever yet told them or can tell them infallibly, that it is infallible. If all Pastors and Doctors may err in their delivery of Christian Doctrin, God would as indifferently oblige us to believe a lye, as his certain verities. If God deprive all Pastors of infallible Assistance, Christian Religion now stands on no more firm ground then mans weak, mutable and erring opinion. Gods infallible Revelation avails nothing in order to Faith, unless Christians lay hold on the certainty thereof by Faith which cannot be don, unless that Oracle which proposeth the Revelation to all be infallible. If the Proponent of a Revelation only say doubtfully. I think God speaks as I preach, but am not certain, the Assent given to his Preaching is also doubtful, and no Faith. Faith surpasseth in its strength and Tendency, all moral and Metaphysical certainty. Though Moral certainty were sufficient for Faith, yet Sectaries have not so much for Protestancy, as it is reformed. How Sectaries err in their search made after Religion, and both weakly and improbably opugn the Doctrin of the Catholick Roman Church. Reflections upon the motives of credibility. It is impossible (after the establishment of true Faith in the world) that God permit a fals Religion to be more clearly evidenced to reason by force of rational Motives, then true Religion is manifested. A fals Religion cannot equalize Gods true Religion in the evidence of prudent motives, inducing to Faith. No Religion hath motives founding moral certainty (prerequisite to Faith) but the Roman Catholick Religion only. Protestants have nothing

X x x 3

Some of the

nothing like rational motives, whereby Protestantcy, as *Protestancy*, is proved to be so much as probable. Where *Mr. Stillingfleet* Treats of resolving Protestants Faith, He waves the Question wholly, and speak's no more in behalf of Protestantcy, then Arianism, or another Heresy. Arguments drawn from Reason against Protestants upon the consideration of the Churches motives. Sectaries cannot for want of prudent motives (inducing to Faith) convert an infidel to Christian Religion. Their Religion Dishonours *Christ* and makes way to any new-coyned Heresy.

THE SECOND DISCOVERS.

Of Scripture.

Scripture is a useles book in the hands of Sectaries, if none, as they confess, Declare infallibly the sense of it in high points of Controversies. Arians interpret Scripture as probably as Protestants, when they oppose the sense received by the Church. Sectaries make Scripture a book, that proves all Religions, and more significant for Arianism then Protestantcy. The fallacy of Protestants concerning the Interpretation of Scripture, is discovered. Grant no infallible Church, we have no Assurance of true and interrupted Scripture. Scripture might be more easily corrupted then a whole Church cheated into false Doctrin. No man can prudently suppose, that God had more care to preserve Scripture uncorrupt, then a Church free from error. All Substantials of Faith are not in Scripture. A Learned Philosopher by his own reading Scripture cannot judge what it meanes in a hundred Passages without an Interpreter. Sectaries now are in the very same case without an infallible Interpreter. Sectaries in their Glosses on Scripture do nothing but add, and substract from Gods Word, When They Oppose the Churches sense of Scripture. Sole Scripture without an infallible Interpreter, can be no Rule of Faith. Protestants have not one word of Scripture for their Religion, as it is *Protestancy*. The Reason of private men, or of a private spirit cannot interpret Scripture. The new mode of Protestants misinterpreting Scripture is amply refuted. All our Sectaries endeavour is to turn Scripture off from the Catholick sense by their own fancies, and then think the work don. It is one thing to say (and only to say it) that Scriptures alleged by us prove not what we intend, and another positively to prove the Doctrin contrary to us to be grounded on Scripture. In this Sectaries always fail. The new mode of Sectaries interpreting Scripture destroyes Protestant Religion. Here is the sequel of Sectaries. No Catholics Prove not what we assert, therfore they make the contrary Doctrin an Article of their new Faith. Faith cannot rely on such Negatives. Of the means left by Almighty God to interpret Scripture. The Holy Ghost only, speaking by the Oracle of the Church, Interpret's Scripture infallibly, in those matters
which

which concern the general belief of all. Protestants, who profess themselves to be fallible in what ever they teach, are no Instruments assumed by the Holy Ghost to teach and interpret infallibly Gods word. No Sectary can judge the Church, but the Church is to judge all Sectaries.

THE THIRD DISCOURS.

Of the unreasonable proceeding of Protestants in some Chief matters of Controversy.

Protestants, who seemingly hold a Catholick Church before *Luther* larger then the Roman Catholick Church, and cannot design it, Proceed unreasonably, and must falsify that Article of our Creed. *I believe the Holy Catholick Church.* Before *Luther* there were no Christians in the world for a thousand years, at least, but Roman Catholicks, and known Hereticks, neither those Catholicks alone (as Protestants say) nor the known Hereticks (nor both together) constituted the true Catholick Church, therefore there was no true Catholick Church on earth for so vast a time. No abstract Doctrin common to all, who are named Christians, is sufficient to constitute Catholick Doctrin. *Mr. Stillingfleet* is confuted, and his Doctrin shewed improbable. Faith in *Christ* only, as a Redeemer, is insufficient to Salvation: A more explicate Faith of other particulars is proved Necessary. If Catholicks and Sectaries are right in the fundamentals of Faith, all the pretended Reformation of Protestants comes to a slight work about *Non-Essentials*, which may have made Things worse then before. It is not the less or more weight of things revealed that makes Faith less or more valued of, but the Submission we yeild to Gods Veracity, which is one, and of equal Authority in what ever he Reveals. Though a Distinction were granted between Fundamentals and not Fundamentals; Yet Protestants cannot so much as probably sever the Fundamentals from the others by any known Principle. If there be no Catholick Church owned (at least) infallible in Fundamentals, all Faith both of *Christ* and Creed may perish before the world ends. And if there be such an Infallible Church in Fundamentals, Sectaries ought to design it, and say, to whom that Spirit is granted, in what subject it resides &c. A Protestant, who so far Denies *Christ*s true Church, That he cannot say where it is, and endeavour's to reform others before he have certainty of his own half well made Reformation, cannot probably go about to withdraw a prudent Catholick from his Religion. Some Propositions of *Mr. Stillingfleet* are examined. His Discours of Fundamentals destroys Protestant Religion. He Speaks of the *Being* of a Church and saith not precisely how much Doctrin constitutes that Being. He cannot name any Orthodox Church that ever Excepted against the Articles believed by the Church of Rome. He makes the Negative Articles of the English Church not to be Articles of Faith, but only

Some of the

only inferior Truths held only in order to peace and tranquillity. His Church therefore is essentially Hypocritical, which may believe one thing and must profess another. Though Protestants were very Papists in heart, yea, and Anathematized all These Negative Articles, They may be looked on as Blessed Children of this new Negative Church, if their Exterior be fairly Protestant-like. He makes his Church no more an English Church than a Church of Arians, and of all condemned Hereticks. He saith the English Church makes no Articles of Faith, but such as have the Approbation of the whole Christian world and of Rome it self. The Assertion is Evidently Vntrue, For no Orthodox Church, no Heretical Society, no Consent of the whole Christian World Ever taught, That a Doctrin wherein all Christians agree is sufficient to Salvation. When Sectaries Say, *Christ* gave to his Disciples a Sign only of his Body. This very Doctrin is either an Article of Their Faith, or one of their Inferiour Truths. If the first; They believe that which never had the approbation of the whole Christian World, much less of Rome it self. If the second be granted: They have no Divine Faith at all of the Blessed Sacrament. The Nullity of our Adversaries ground's is declared, though the Church made new Articles of Faith. If we speak rigorously, The Church makes no new Articles, but only declares more Explicitly what was anciently believed. The Fathers call the Church a rich Treasury wherein the *Depositum* of Apostolical Doctrin is securely preserved. The Analogy of Faith is explicated. There was a Platform of Christian Religion before Scripture was writ, and the Apostles separated Themselves and Preach't to several Nations. Sectaries who seemingly acquiesce in the Judgment of one or two Ancient Fathers, most inconsequently reject the Authority of a Learned General Council that is of greater weight and Estimation. If the Churches Definitions are therefore to be thought fallible, because men declare them, and all men are lyars; much more are our Sectaries Novelties and Glosses on Scripture to be valued of as Fallible upon the same ground. These fallible men tell me my Churches Doctrin is fallible, suppose falsely it were so, it is altogether as good as this very fallible Proposition is that sayes 'Tis Fallible; and if (which is true) it be infallible, it is much better. No man that holds His Religion fallible, can probably endeavour to convert an other, though the contrary Religion Professed by this other be acknowledged to be no more but fallible. Much less can he persecute Him for not yeilding Assent to a fallible Religion. All the Storms of persecution raised against Catholicks are not upon any account of want of Faith, but for this sole cause, that we will not believe one thing and force our Consciences to Profess an other: Which is to say, we are persecuted because we will not be Hypocrits.

*The Unreasonableness of Protestants Schism laid forth,
from the VIII. Chap. of the third Discours to the XV.*

THe Separation of Protestants from the Roman Catholick Church, is as plain and manifest a sinful Schism, as ever was Derried Rebellion in a Kingdom, or any Violation of a Countries Right. The formal Schism of Sectaries, is evident, but the Causal charged on Catholicks, is no more but an unproved Calumny. Proofs brought to received Principles fail Sectaries, whilst they make the Roman Church to be the cause of their Formal Schism, The supposed errors charged on the Roman Catholick Church by Sectaries are not like the first Principles in nature, Evident *ex terminis*, and therefore must be proved by a Discours grounded on certain Principles. We Licence Sectaries in their Discours against us, to make use of all Imaginable sound Principles, Scripture, Fathers, Tradition, or what They pleas, and only exclude Their own self-voting from the nature of a rational Proof and Principle. When a Rebellion is manifest in a Kingdom, the sole Authority, of them who began it, is insufficient to make it Justifiable: And the Authority of Sectaries is as forceles to Justify their Schism against the Church. Whilst Evidence comes not against our Church, it stand's most firm upon its ancient possessed right. This long Possession proves our Church Orthodox. Examples Hereof. *Mr. Stillingfleet* Exceptions against our pleading Possession, are proved to be weak, forceles, and meer ungrounded Suppositions. Though the Obligation of proving Evidently lies on our Adversaries, who are the Aggressors, yet we prove not only a personal Succession of our Popes and Prelates in forgoing Ages, but also manifest a Quiet Possession of Truth that descended with these continued Popes and Bishops from the dayes of *S. Peter* to this very Age. No just Exception can be made against our Tradition, which is Evidently its one Proof, for there cannot be a clearer. *Mr. Stillingfleet* supposeth that our Right of pleading Truth is a meer Occupancy. He is to prove this because he is the Accuser. No Antecedent Law hath determined Contrary to what we Challenge by vertue of our Possession. We have both the Law for us, and ancient Possession, besides; And there is no Reason when we allege two Proofs, Law and Possession, that we Quire the one, which is Possession, as *Mr. Stillingfleet* pretend's we should do, which is against all rational Discours of this subject. It is improbable to say, that Protestants first saw these supposed errors imputed to our Church, when others as Quick-sighted, more numerous and Learned then They, saw them not for ten whole Ages before Luther. It is a degree of madness to suppose, that all those worthy and Learned Professors of the Catholick Faith were either so stupidly blind, as not to have seen such supposed errors, or so wickedly Hypocritical as to have winked at them, after their plain Discovery. It is a Paradox to say, that our

Some of the

new men saw these too plain and visible errors, when that great Catholick Church (which Sectaries make more large then the Roman) saw them not, but permitted Rome to countenance these supposed errors, without check or reprehension. Of the Impossibility of errors entering the Church after the first 4, or 5 hundred years. Though Sectaries should convince (which is impossible) the Roman Catholick Church to be guilty of error, yet they cannot show that they have set Christian Faith right again on its old Foundations, as it once stood pure. All Principles fail them in this particular. Fancy only, and nothing like a rational Proof, uphold's this charge of error against our Church. *Mr Stillingfleet's* Assertions are refuted. If the Roman Catholick Church has erred by imposing unreasonable conditions, Sectaries who Profess themselves fallible in all they say, may have erred more and spoil'd all they went about to mend. Nothing can be more unreasonable, then to make a few Rebellious people receding from an ancient Church first to accuse it, and then to sit judges in their own cause, and condemn it. None can probably show, that these late Reformers of Protestants, who opposed all other Religions, are untainted, or purely Orthodox. As no men before the Donatists made the Church so strait as they did: so never Christians before these later Sectaries made it so wide, as to hold in it all the Hereticks in the world. Protestantism, as Protestantism, is no Christian Religion at all, if the belief of that Doctrine which is common to all Christians be amply sufficient to Salvation. Protestants may Anathematize all the Doctrine within the compass of their reformed Religion, and yet be saved.

THE FOURTH DISCOVERS.

Of the Churches Evidence, and Improbability of Protestant Religion.


Protestants, as they make not good their own Doctrine, by Proofs grounded on certain Principles: so they never impugn the Roman Catholick Faith by rational Arguments. Catholicks contrarywise prove their Churches Doctrine by undeniable Principles. The Grounds of Catholick Religion are briefly laid forth. As it is an evident Principle, that all those Wise and Learned Doctors who taught Christians Popery for a thousand years, were neither fools nor perversely blind. So it is more evident, that God suffered not those millions of Christians, instructed by these Teachers, to be grossly abused with false Doctrine, whilst there was no other Catholick Society in the world to unbeguile them. All other Sectaries, who deserted the Roman Catholick Church erred grossly: and it is improbable to think, that Protestants only among so many straying Teachers, were the only privileged people, elected by God to mend (had any thing been amiss, in a old decayed Church, without mixture of error,

our, or marring more then they mended. Protestantcy is unevidenced, and improbable Religion, that is, no Religion, but a fancied opinion. No Co-
infallibly taught, as Protestantcy is, can be ultimately resolved into Gods
infallible Revelation. Scripture alone without an infallible Interpreter makes
man infallible. A Doctrin which at its first rise was, and is still opposed by
all Christians (excepting the Sectaries who broach it) is as improbable, as Arrian-
ism. A Church essentially errable, may lose all Truth, and consequently all
Grace, and so become divorced from *Christ*. A Doctrin proved improbable
by undoubted Principles, cannot be made credible by rational Arguments, unless
Truth be contrary to Truth. Of the slight way of Sectaries Arguing against Catho-
lick Doctrin. *Mr. Stillingfleet*, like his other Brethren, in a Discours of Purga-
tory, begins with leers, with Mistakes, and dissembling of Difficulties. He
states not the Question rightly between the Latin and Greeks. The Dispute be-
tween the Latins and Greeks is clearly laid forth by *Leo Alatus* a Grecian.
What passed in the Council of Florence concerning This Dispute. The Greeks
most certainly, both before and after the Council held, a place of punishment for
souls departed, from which place they are freed by the Prayers of the Living.
They also hold that souls enjoy the beatifical Vision before the day of Judge-
ment. The weakness of our Adversaries cause is best seen by a Parallel of
Proofs for Purgatory and against it. The Catholick Principles for Purgatory,
S. Austin was not the first that held Purgatory. *Mr. Stillingfleet* misunderstands
two passages in *S. Austin*. The Sectary when He Explicates Scripture or Fathers,
makes his own Gloss the surest ground of his Interpretation. When the Catho-
lick explicates a dubious passage, He relies on a sure Principle distinct from his
Interpretation. Objections are Answered. How the Supplications of the
Church respect mercy and Forgiveness to be shewed the just at the Day of Jud-
gement. An Objection is proposed in behalf of Sectaries, and solved in another
Discours concerning the Blessed Sacrament. The Grounds of our Catholick
Doctrin for the Real Presence. The contrary Opinion of Sectaries is proved to
be meer Fancy. Sectaries cannot by vertue of any one received Principle re-
move the Catholick from the plain and Obvious sense of *Christ*s most significant
words. The Testimonies of Fathers are as clear for our Catholick Doctrin, as
the words of the Council of Trent. A Parallel of Proofs for and against the
Doctrin of the Real Presence. The way of Sectaries is, chiefly to lose Them-
selves in proposing difficulties against us, without casting a serious thought on
sure Principles that solve them. They find the Mystery of the Blessed sacra-
ment uneasy to sense, but reflect not, that They believe two or three other
Mysteries fully as hard, if not more difficile, for Example, a Trinity, the In-
carnation, and Original sin. It is most Evident, what Ever Principle
(whether it be Scripture, Church Authority, or consent of Fathers) that mo-
ves to believe these Verities, that very Principle is as pressing, forceable and
urging, yea and often more exprefs for the Belief of our Sacrament wherat they
boggle. What the Sectary is obliged to prove, if He except against our grounds

Y y y a

in

A FEW NOTES
UPON
MR. POOLES APPENDIX,
AGAINST
CAPTAIN EVERARD.

1.  Say a few for I must be brief; finding very little to stay me in the Appendix which is not directly solved in the foregoing Treatise. And therefore wonder not, if I often remit the Reader to the former Discourses as occasion requires, it being impossible to reply to an Adversary upon this subject of *Infallibility*, without touching on what is sayd already, where the Direct Answer is given to His objections. I would not indeed have writ thus much against M^r. Poole, but only to hinder a little vanity in the man, for if no notice had bin taken of his Appendix, He might perhaps have thought too well of his work, and judged it so learned a piece that none would Dare to meddle with it. To gain what time is possible, I pass by all His jeers, his harsher language, and Calumnies cast on Catholick &c. Those Personal exceptions also unjustly made against the Converted Captain, and some vulgar Difficulties solved a hundred times, shall give me no work at present, who will only fall (and closely) upon that

that which Mr. Poole (its likely) may think most material, and to the purpose. And because the best strength He hath, lies in the beginning of the Appendix, I'll examin that most, and make his errors manifest by sound proofs and Principles. Briefly.

2. The occasion of Mr. Everards Conversion was a Discours held with a Catholick Gentleman. *Who Asked me (saith the Captain) whether I was so certainly infallibly assured of the Truth of the Christian Religion, that it was not possible for me, or those that taught me Christianity to be mistaken therein; and He gave me this reason for his question, that otherwise, as to me, Christianity could be no more then probably true, And we could not condemn the Jew or Turk, or Pagan, since they were as well perswaded of their several wayes, as we could be of ours upon a fallible certainty, And for ought we knew (not having any infallible certainty for our Christianity) some of them might be in the right, and we in the wrong way, for it is possible, you may be mistaken.* Thus Mr. Poole Appendix page 8. who slight's the Discours, as silly, weak, and ungrounded.

3. I say Contrary. The Discours is strong, rational, and most convincing. The ground of my Assertion further declared Disc. 1. c. 1. 2. is thus. A Doctrine which by vertue of all the Principles it hath (or can rely on) cannot but be fallibly taught by all Teachers now within the bounds of Christianity, is, by force of its Proposition, and merit of the Doctrine (precisely considered) most certainly fallible, and may be fals. But such a taught Doctrine, which by vertue of all the Principles it hath, (or can rely on) and merit also of the Doctrine, or force of its Proposition, is fallible and may be fals, is not the certain Doctrine of Christ, which cannot

not by the vertue of any Principle it hath or merit of the Doctrin, and force of its proposition, be either fallible or fals, *Ergo* such a taught Doctrin is not *Christs* certain Doctrin, which neither is, nor can be fallible or fals. Now further. A Doctrin which is not *Christs* certain Doctrin (because removed from certain Principles) can be no other but the Doctrin of mans *errable judgement or Fancy*, And consequently gives as little Assurance to him that teaches it *fallibly*, or those that hear it, as that of the Jewes gives to them. Observe my reason, equally Convincing in both cases. Therefore we say, the Doctrin of a Jew gives no Assurance to Him that Teaches, and those who hear it, because it is removed from all infallible Principles, and relies only on his errable judgement or Fancy that teaches it, but the Fallible Doctrin of these Sectaries now mentioned, is also removed from all *Infallible Principles* (for no man amongst them can deliver Doctrin *infallibly*) Therefore it relies only on an errable judgement or fancy that teaches it, and by good consequence, is none of *Christs* infallible Doctrin. But if it be none of *Christs* Doctrin, it gives no more Assurance to them that Hear it, than the Doctrin of a Jew gives to any of his Sect, *Ergo*. Here briefly is my Ground and I would see it Answered.

If you say the Doctrin of a Jew is not only fallible, but fals also, you suppose what is to be proved against him.

4. Some perhaps will say, the Doctrin of these Sectaries relies on Gods Word, and that alone is a sure and infallible Principle. I answer, if we speak of Sectaries particular Doctrin *as reformed*, They have not one Article clearly, no nor so much as probably grounded on Gods expresse word, for Scripture saith no where that *Faith only justifies, that all Churches are fallible, that there is*

no Purgatory, no Sacrifice of the Altar, &c. Ergo these Doctrins want certain Principles. Now if they Reply, Though these particular Doctrins are not express in Scripture, yet the general Truths of Christianity are, And They rely on these, not caring for more. I Answer, Though these Verities *as revealed* be infallible in themselves, yea and infallible also to the Catholick that admit's of them as infallible, for the certain Testimony of his Church, yet no man, no Church, no *Oracle of Truth*, ever hitherto assured the Protestant *infallibly*, that they are infallible (for all these with him are fallible) therefore They are removed from the nature of being certain Principles in order to his Faith and Doctrin also, unles He say that the Objective infallibility of Scripture is evident *ex terminis* to the very eyes that read the book, which is proved improbable Disc. 1. c. 12. n. 4. Wherof more presently. I Answer. 2. If the Objective infallibility of these great Verities be a certain Principle to the Protestant, it either Derives into his understanding that teaches them a *Subjective infallibility* in order to his Doctrin; or leaves him as He was before lyable to mistake and errour, if the first be granted; He is *Subjectively* infallible when He teaches, and this He will not hear of. Grant the second viz. That He is lyable to mistake and errour in his teaching, He may well miss of the objective Truth, because He only saith *fallibly* what God speaks *infallibly*, and consequently his Doctrin *ultimately resolved*, saith no more but *timidly* thus much: *Perhaps* I declare what God speaks, and it may be not, for my Declaration is *fallible* and may be *fals*, Therefore you Christians who hear me, can believe nothing *infallibly*, becaus my very Teach-

Teaching is doubtful, And it is against the nature of a doubt, to convey *certainity* into any understanding. See Disc. 1. c. 4. n. 7. 8. Now if you Ask why it is doubtful, though he speak truth as it were by Chance, I answer the Reason is: Because he hath no Principle which determinates his teaching to say that *Infallibly* which God speak's *infallibly*. The External Principle of Scripture makes him no more Infallible, than the worst of Hereticks who read it, And all other Principles He works by, are lyable to error. And here briefly you see the difference between the Truth of an *Act*, and its *Certitude*, The first only sayes in contingent matters a *conformity with the Object*; The other, a necessary Determination to Truth by Principles not liable to error, And Sectaries alwaies want these Principles, whilst They teach a Doctrin *fallibly*. If here they take recourse to moral certainty only and think that sufficient, turn to the fifth Chapter of the first Discours and you will see them evidently confuted. It is lost labour to repeat again what is sayd in that place.

5. These grounds supposed, you shall see how Mr. Pooles Exceptions against them comes to nothing. Let us saith He P. 9. n. 2. examin a little the strength of this pretty Proposition viz. *That if we be not infallibly assured of the Truth of Christianity, Jewes, Turks and Pagans are as well perswaded of their wayes, as we (Christians) of ours. What a mad Assertion* (saith He) *is this, that nothing is credible, but what is infallibly certain, and that there is no difference between Probabilities and Improbabilities &c.* To this I answer in a word, (you shall have the Reason hereafter) Nothing in true Christianity is credible, but what both may, and must be believed by most certain faith,

in other moral matters things are morally credible; though we arrive not to certainty, but Faith hath its exceptions. *M. Poole* goes on. *I am not infallibly certain, that there is such a place as Iamaica (for it is possible that all Geographers may mistake, and Travellers may lye) Therefore I am as uncertain that there is a sea-passage to China by the North Sea. I am not certain, if I find a Calf in a field, but that it may (as some time it was) drop't from the Clouds, but will any sober man think that it came not from a cow?* He hath other instances to this purpose, And the man (if I mistake not) would here liken the certainty of that Truth we have of *Christianity*, to the certainty we have of *Iamaica* and a calf coming from a Cow, and the Doctrin of *Judaism* He would have so improbable, as if one should say, the Calf was dropt from the Clouds. In a word if He dispute with a Jew, He will hear that his whole Discours is *Petisio principii*, and that his Instances of *Iamaica* and a calf are nothing to the purpose, because he supposeth what should be proved viz. That the Doctrin of a Jew is so improbable to that Sect, as this Antagonist makes it, And that the taught Doctrin of Sectaries is so highly Probable in order to them, as is here supposed. Alas, the Jew wil utterly silence *M. Poole* with this convincing Reason. What ever becomes of my Doctrin, I tell you, your Protestant taught Doctrin which may be fals, is no better than mine, because it is not ultimately resolvable into Gods infallible *Revelation* which cannot be fals. That it cannot be thus resolved is evident, because a Doctrin that is fallible and may be fals (though true in it self) as fallible and lyable to falsity, cannot be, as it were, cast or laid on Gods *infallible Veracity*, that essentially Disowns and
re-

rejects all Doctrin that's fallible, and may be fals. Therefore, as *Fallible*, ultimately resolved, it must be brought to its one home, which is not Gods infallible Revelation, but to meer fancy, or some other uncertainty. For example: Put the case, that an English Synode truly Defines: *Christ Iesus* is God and man, yet so that the Definition by vertue of all the Principles it hath, or its own intrinsic merit, is fallibly Delivered. One reflects on this Definition and consider's the *Truth* of it, which is a conformity with its object, as also the *Weaknes* of it, which is *Fallibility* for want of Principles that Determin it to Truth. I Ask now why Do Sectaries believe *christ* to be God and man by this Fallible Definition ('T is one of your Acts of Faith is it not?) You must Answer; you Believe so because God hath said it in Scripture. Very good. But I Ask again? Hath he said this *Fallibly* by a Revelation that's capable of falsity? No must evidently, His Revelation is infinitely certain, Ergo I say your Definition or Act of Faith, *Quâ fallibilis*, or as *meerly fallible*, cannot under that Notion of *Fallibility*, rest upon an infallible Veracity, for this infallible Veracity hath neither *measure* nor *Proportion* with a fallible Assent, nor can a fallible Assent have any *measure* or *Proportion* with an infallible Revelation. Mark therefore well the Resolution of this whole Assent. *I believe Christ to be God and man by a fallible Act which may be fals, because Gods infallible Revelation which can neither be fallible or fals, Moves me to believe so*, And most justly call it no Faith at all, for an infallible Revelation Moves none to believe *fallibly*, therefore the tendency of this Act, as it is *Fallible*, Moves forward without a *Divine Motive* to rely on, and
hitt's

that can neither deceive nor be deceived.

9. Perhaps you will say : Though this Veracity of God be infinitely infallible in it self, yet one may rely on it with an Act only Morally certain, and you require no more for Faith. I grant the case is possible, but withall say such an Act is no Faith (as is largely proved *Disc. 1. c. 5. and 6.* because it is not ultimately resolvable into Gods infallible veracity as the last *Motive* to rest on, but into some other inferiour Motive extrin-sick, and Distinct from *Gods Revelation*. Put the case, that three or four Learned Heathen Philosophers of good repute, Assure one of their sect upon their Credit and humane Authority, They cannot but judge, all things considered, that God hath revealed the Incarnation of the Divine word in Holy Scripture. Admit also that the Hearer, because he esteems them knowing, upright, and sincere, yeilds his assent to that Revelation meerly for their Authority : The *Formal Object* or *Motive* of his Assent is not (if the supposition stand) Divine Revelation, for this is only yet the Material Object *Believed* upon humane Authority, consequently it cannot be an Act of Faith, For Faith as Faith, precisely rest's alwaies on Gods Revelation as the last and ultimate Motive, without the mixture of any other. See *Disc. 1. c. 5. n. 5. 6.* as also *Chap. 6.* Now if you desire to know more concerning the certainty of him that Proposeth the Object of Faith darkly revealed in Holy Scripture, read the 4. Chap. of the first Discours.

10. By what is said hitherto, you se (Good *Mr. Poole*) that true Christian Religion must either signify the Objective Infallibility of Gods Revelation, or the Assent of Faith wherby we Captivate our understanding.

Gods infallible Revelation. The second is the matter believed by vertue of this infallible Revelation. The third is a firm act of Faith, that tends into the Revelation and the matter Revealed, upon that Devine motive Infallibly Proposed, And this firm Assent of Faith, intrinsically Denominates all good Christians *Faithfull Believers*. I say *infallibly Proposed*: For if a Revelation lie as it sometime doth dark in Holy Scripture, a *Proponent* is necessary, that brings it to more light, And as I noted *Disc. 1. C. 4.* According to the measure or degrees of certitude which the Proponent gives to an obscure Revelation, An Assent in the Hearer followes and no stronger. If He only say probably God speaks thus, The assent can be no more but probable, if with truth he say certainly, it is certain. These things supposed be pleased to reflect once more on *Mr. Pooles* words. *What a mad Assertion is This? That nothing is Credible* (He means concerning the Truth of Christianity) *but what is infallibly certain, and that there is no difference between Probabilities, and Improbabilities.* He would say, it is madness to judge so, and Wisdom to make the Truth of Christianity highly Probable, and Judaism improbable.

8. Now I say. *Nothing that essentially Constitutes the truth of Christianity is less then certain, Nothing in it can be so meanly thought of, as to be called only probable.* And first if we speak of the Material Objects believed, These Solely and *Objectively* considered (may we use proper Terms) are neither Probable nor improbable, for there is no Probability in Objects, every thing being what it is in *its self*, independent of my Probable or Improbable *Affertion*. No man when He see's the sun so darkly

b

through

ture is Divine, true, and certain in it self; but not *quoad nos*, therefore hitherto there is no difference. It is not worth the while to insist here upon a Catacresis or abuse of words, or to say how impossible these two termes combined together are in the Papist. *Opinion*, and *certainity of the Object*: For Catholicks in Matters of Faith content not themselves with a bare opinion, where there is *certitudo Objecti* or Gods certain Revelation duely proposed, that exacts from them no *Opinion*, but a sure Assent of Faith, And so we say that the infallibility of the Church is a matter believed by us, because God hath revealed it, consequently its no *Opinion*. But Sir, this is not what I ayme at. We will hear you say all, And come to the strength of the Difficulty. If say you, it be a sufficient foundation for a Romanist, that He hath such probable evidence of this Doctrin of the Churches infallibility, why should it not be as sufficient a foundation for a Protestant, that He hath such (nay infinitely more) probable evidence of the Doctrin of the Scriptures infallibility? Since the evidence of the later is granted by the Papists Themselves, and the evidence of the former (that is of the Churches infallibility) not only denied and Disputed down by Protestants, but also questioned by their own Authors. You End. This Question I chalenge the whole Club of Jesuits solidly to Answer. I Answer very catagorically without Clubbing it, and say first. The Catholick hath more then meer probable Evidence of the Doctrin of the Churches infallibility. The Sectary by his own Principles, hath not so much as probable evidence of the Doctrin of the Scriptures infallibility, Independent of the Church. I say 2. Though the Sectary had probable evidence of the Scriptures infallibility, yet it is a useless book in his hands.

perly be called *fallible* or *infallible*, then *probable* and *improbable*. No man saith that a stone which he sees in the high way, is either fallible or infallible, probable or improbable. The Reason is, Because these Terms, *certain*, *fallible*, *infallible*, *probable*, *improbable*, &c. note ever the tendency of *vital Acts* proceeding from an intellectual power, And therefore most improperly belong to objects, neither vital, nor intellectual. Thus much only by the Bye. Now to your foxing it and fearful Dilemma. Either (say you) a *subjective certainty or infallibility of Belief*, (mark your own words) of the *Truth of Christianity* is necessary for particular Christians, or it is not. If it be not necessary, then Papists too vainly boast of it, and must confess *probable evidence* sufficient for particular Christians; and *infallibility* necessary only for the Pope and Council: if a *subjective infallibility* be necessary for particular Christians, then every Papist in England hath a Pope in his belly, &c. Here is the substance of your Dilemma, and it is a strange piece of confused Stuff. Observe well. You begin with the *Subjective infallibility of the Belief of the Truth of Christianity*, and then run further then to *Iamaica*, to talk of that which you call *the probable evidence of it*. Good Sir, *the evidence of credibility* belonging to true Christianity, is totally distinct from the infallible belief of it. That; if we make a right Analysis, precedes Faith, Faith followes, and is far more certain then the judgement is, all have of the Evidence of Credibility. See Disc. 1. c. 7. 8. 9. 10. Briefly I say first. The belief of true Christianity is *subjectively infallible*, in every faithful Christian, who therefore may have as sound Faith as the Pope himself, or any that sitt's in Council. The Reason, already given and further declared Disc. 1. c. 11

long to the Persons that Teach infallibly and not to Scripture, is undoubted. *Mark 16. 17. These signs shall follow, in my name they shall cast out Devils &c.* Again not only the Doctor of the Gentils. *2. Cor. 12. 12.* call's the wonders He wrought, *Signa Apostolatus sui*, the marks of his Apostleship, but a greater Doctor also, Truth it self *John 10. 25.* (when the Jewes would not believe him) remitted them to the evidence of his Miracles. *The works which I do in the name of my Father, these give Testimony of me,* And *vers. 38. If you will not believe me, believe the works.* Works therefore and wonders Annexed to the persons, or Church that Teaches; Forceably induce prudent men to believe the certain Doctrine Delivered by them, who shew such wonders. In a word, here is all I would say. No Religion is evidently true or fals *ex Terminis*, upon the bare Affirmation of Him that sayes its true or fals, Therefore it must have the Evidence of its Credibility manifested, before Christians admit of the Doctrine. But this Evidence is first manifested by such signs and Miracles, as *Christ* and the Apostles personally shewed to the world, and by vertue of them induced Aliens from Trinth, to believe it as Infallible Doctrine, Therefore whatever Church shewes such Miracles, the like signs and wonders as *Christ* and his Apostles manifested, plead's as well for the Infallibility of its Doctrine witnessed by such Miracles, as the Apostolical Church Did. But the Roman Catholick Church only and no other, shewes these Miracles, *Efficacy of Doctrine, Vniuersality, strange Conversions* and other most Convincing Motives, Therefore if the first Christians induced by such evidence, firmly believed the Apostolical Doctrine to be infallible (which was not ex

terminis evidently infallible) we may now upon the very like Inducements (not for the inducements as the last Motive) Believe as securely upon our *Churches Authority* the Doctrin taught by it, to be infallible. Deny this Evidence of our Motives, and we force Sectaries to prove the Denial by as sure Principles, as we Assert them: Grant them and our Argument is concluding. And here you have more them a meer probable Evidence of the Churches infallibility.

§ 5. An other Argument for it, besides those Scriptures cited *Disc. 2. C. 6. n. 3.* is not only probable, but unanswerably Convincing, hinted at *Disc. 1. C. 2. n. 9.* *Christ* as is confessedly granted both by Catholicks and Sectaries, sent Pastors up and down the world to teach Christian Doctrin, But he never sent any to teach fallible Doctrin which may be fals, Ergo He sent them to teach his own infallible Doctrin, and *Infallibly*. I prove it. He sent none to teach any other Doctrin then that, which may be ultimately resolved into Gods infallible Veracity revealing Truth: But that which is ultimately resolved into an infallible Veracity, can neither be fals nor fallible Doctrin, because God as I now said, ownes no fallible Doctrin that may be fals, Therefore, this Resolution of an Act tending *fallibly* into Devine Revelation, is rather Non-sense then Faith. I *fallibly* believe *Christ* to be God and Man, because Gods *infallible* Revelation will have me so believe so: For No Infallible Motive applied to my understanding, as it is *infallible*, can draw from me a fallible belief of a Doctrin that's meerly fallible. But All Sectaries, whether *Arians*, *Donatists*, or *Protestants* Teach only fallible Doctrin, and *fallibly Ex parte Docentis*, Ergo they Teach not that Doctrin which *Christ* sent his Ministers to teach,

or that can be resolved into Gods infallible Veracity revealing Truth. Yet most certainly, some Christian Pastors by vertue of *Christ Mission*, teach his infallible Doctrine infallibly, and these are the Pastors of the Roman Catholick Church, who only lay claim to Infallibility and prove it also, as the Apostles Did by the Antecedent Evidence of those Motives, which the Church shewes and manifesteth to the world, as is now Declared. I challenge Mr. Poole, directly and Categorically to Answer this my Reason (without talking any more of Clubbs, or running into Generalities) and in as few clear words as I Deliver it.

16. Now to prove the other part of my Assertion. *Viz. Sectaries by their own principles have not so much as a probable Evidence of the Scriptures infallibility, without Church Authority?* Here is my principle. The infallibility of Scripture which contains many Difficulties, tell's strange stories, and seemingly often speak's contradictions, is not by *it self or own light*, so evidently Credible to the Eyes of a Reader, as the infallibility of the Apostolical Church was evident by *Miracles*, and *Conversions* to the Primitive Christians, who believed it infallibly: At least S. Austin judged it not so Evidently Credible, when He saith, *He would not believe the Gospel under the Authority of the Church moved him to believe it.* The Infallibility of it therefore, must by proved by some good Principles extrinseck to Scripture, but the Sectary hath not one sound Principle, Distinct from the Tradition and Authority of the Church whereby this Infallibility is proved, Therefore Scripture in order to Him is not so Infallible, as the Church is to the Catholick. If any Deny my principle, and make the Scriptures *Infallibility*

bility Discernable by its own light, by the Majesty, of the style, purity of its Doctrine, or efficacy it works in the minds of those who read it &c. I think there are evident Demonstrations against the Paradox: For as I noted *Disc. 1. C. 2. 12. n. 4.* Two things are to be considered in Scripture, first, the *exteriour Syntax* or Connexion of the words, and so much precisely is not the Scriptures total Infallibility, which sayes more besides that exteriour language, and necessarily implies A *Divine Act* a *Volition*, or *Decree of God*, wherby the Hagiographers that writ the words, were infallibly assisted, and determined to record truth, and nothing but Truth, Now this Divine *Volition* or Decree becaus it is essential to God, and therefore no other but God Himself, can be no Object of our senses, when we hear or read Scripture: Consequently it is to be Discovered by a Discours grounded on Principles, distinct from the outward letter of Scripture, wherby we may come to a sure Evidence of its Infallibility, not at all yet within the reach of our senses, And this no Sectary can do, as I shall presently make Evident.

17. I say Therefore, if the Motives now alleged for the Churches Infallibility, as *Conversions*, *Miracles Universal* &c. induce not immediatly to believe that Church they demonstrate to be Infallible, much less can the exteriour words or syntax of Scripture, be a fit *Medium* to Convince any of its Infallibility. And to prove this, besides what is often noted in the Treatise, Chiefly *Disc. 1. C. 8. n. 7.* Ill here only Propose two Questions, The first: Whether if *S. John*, who was infallibly Assisted, had not recorded that short sentence in His Gospel: *The Word is made flesh*, but some other not infallibly

infallibly Assisted by the Spirit of God, had written the very same Verity, as it were by Chance : My Question I say is, whether the Sectary that now reads this sentence in *S. Iohn* Gospel, can more Discover an *Infallibility* in it by force of the outward words, then if they had been Casually written by one without Infallible Assistance? I think He will not dare to say yes ; or if He Do, I'll urge Him to prove it by Principles, when the outward words are the Very same in both Cases, and in like manner clear to all that read them. My second Demand may yet perhaps better evidence what I ayme at, and is thus. Suppose that our Sectaries should put the book of *Ecclesiastes*, which they hold Canonical, into the hands of twelve learned Gentile Philosophers, and with it the book of *Wisdom* or *Ecclesiasticus* also, not held Canonical by them : Suppose again, They desire these learned and disinterested men, seriously to read these three books, and after the reading Sincerely to tell them, which of them hath Gods Spirit in it, or contains *his infallible Verities*, For, this may be easily gathered by the very natural evidence of what they read, by the *Majesty* of the style, *Efficacy* of speaking which appears Clearly enough in the outward letter. Thus much don ; seperate these Philosophers, by four and four, into three Companies, put them into three different cells, much after that manner, as some say, the seventy Interpreters were separated. Let them with all sincerity read, examin, and peruse these Books ; and if when the work is ended, they unanimously accord, that a greater Divinity, a stronger *infallibility* appear's in the song of Salomon, then in the other two books, we will say something is proved, and hold

it as strange a Miracle, as that which *S. Austin* recounts of the 70. Interpreters. Now if Any tell us, this light of Scripture, though sufficient in it self, is not evident to every one that looks on it, because the blindnes or perversnes of mens minds may keep them from the Discovery of it : The Reply hath no place here, for we suppose first, these Philosophers to be disinterested, learned, upright and sincere, as well in their reading, as in the judgement they give of it, And secondly we will suppose, that all those are not blind whom Sectaries make blind, nor only those quick sighted (I mean themselves) whom they will have so.

18. To these Questions I add one more, it may pass for an Argument *Ad hominem* against Sectaries, who hold all the Definitions of our Church, even when they are true, to be yet fallible. I Ask, whether these Quick sighted men are able to Discern the *Fallibility* of these Definitions, by force of the outward words thereof only, as they Discover the infallibility of Scripture by the Majesty of the style, and outward Syntax. And mark where the force of the Difficulty lies. As *Infalibility* necessarily implies Divine Assistance in order to the Truths Delivered in holy Scripture, so the supposed *Fallibility* of the Churches Definitions, implies a want of that Assistance in order to those Definitions. I Ask therefore, whether as the first is Discernable and visible enough to their Eyes, by the very context of the outward letter, They will consequently grant, that the other also is as clearly visible, and Discernable by the very words of the Definition? If They Answer yes, First they need not hereafter to impugn the Churches Definitions.

Definitions by any other *Medium* but this, that they are without further proof by themselves *evidently fallible*: So much is said by them, and it proof enough. 2. They may as well say, They know when a man tell's a lye, and this by force of his very speaking, as that they know the supposed *Fallibility* of the Churches Definitions by her speaking: For, if their eyes can Discern the want of Divine Assistance in the one case (which really is not wanting) they may more easily Discern the want of Truth in the other (which really is wanting.) And if this be not a Paradox, there was never any in the world. Now contrarywise, if they cannot Discover the Churches supposed *Fallibility* in her Definitions meerly by her Exterior words, because that is a thing invisible, I would gladly learn how They come to know the *Infallibility* of Scripture by the words Therof, for that is as much (if not more) invisible, and as far removed from our eyes and senses.

19. Some, who piteously suppose, Scriptures to be proved *Divine* and *Infallible* by the very light which is in them Object first. When we see the sun, and the vast extent of the light it has, we may well infer it comes from that luminous body, And may we not (say These) proportionably infer, from the *clearnes, Gracious, Majesty, and Coherency* of those *Truths* revealed in Scripture, that they must certainly come from none but God? *Ans.* What will not men say at last, who dare Propose such evident improbabilities? Why, the whole world agrees in this that the light comes from the sun, for it is evident to our senses, but do all unanimously agree about the very Canon of Scripture, or the clearnes of those books all admit of, which are evidently obscure in

in a hundred passages, and so seemingly incoherent in many other places, that it is mighty Difficile to reconcile them? Again. What more *Greatnes* or *exteriour Majesty*, can any Discover in Salomons Proverbs, then in the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus; or in those two pious Hymns *Te Deum*, and *Gloria in Excelsis*? such arguments therfore are not only slight, but improbable.

20. They Object 2. The works of Creation Evidence Gods Wisdom Power, and Greatnes. *Ergo* God can give as great evidence of a Revelation. Answ. I grant He can do so, But What then? Doth it follow that He hath don it *de facto* by the words internal to Scripture (which is here only to the purpose?) without the light of other Motives, as Miracles, Conversions and the like, which as I now said, immediately manifest the Church, and not the book of Scripture.

21. They object 3. No other way is conceivable, that it should be evident that a Doctrin comes from God (and consequently is infallible) but that it contains things highly *suitable to the Divine nature*, things above the *finding out of human reason*, things only tending to Advance *Holines* and *Goodnes* in the world. And this Doctrin to be Delivered by persons, who wrought Unparallel'd Miracles. And They ask, whether all these be not in the most evident manner *Imaginable* contained in the Doctrin of *Christianity* and in the *books of Scripture*? I Answer first: The Opponent is far from Conceiving any thing like a probability in this Objection. For, if it be evident that a Doctrin comes from God, and therefore infallible, because it contains Things suitable to the Divine nature, the very Gentils without other

other Motives should as well see this Evidence, as we see the light of the Sun. Now if you say its an Evidence, but not perceptible by all you run into Darknes, Destroy the Nature of Evidence, and make it now evident now unevident, when, and to whom you please. If again you say its an Evidence sufficient to breed Faith, you beg the Question and speak improbably for nothing can beget Faith but what is owned for Gods infallible Word upon prudent Motives, and the Testimony of some Infallible Oracle. To confirm what is here said, I Ask whether if *Christ* and his Apostles had appeared in the World, and only preached the high Mysteries of our Faith as a *Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, *Original sin*, with other Doctrins now registred in Scripture that advance Holines of life &c. But all this without doing one Miracle, Converting one Nation, or shewing any the least wonder, that they were sent from God; to teach as they did. My Question I say is, whether upon this supposition, either Jewes or Gentils would then have believed them or could have discovered an *Infallibility* in a Doctrin thus Orally Delivered, or writ in patchment meerly by the force of the words. If Sectaries say *Yes*, They do not only speak a Paradox which no Christian ever uttered, and make our Saviours Argument Against the Jewes (*Si opera &c.* If I had not don works amongst them which no other did they would not have sin) null and inefficacious, but moreover are convinced by this clear proof. Suppose, (And it implies no impossibility) that God, who hath yet within the vast reach of His *Omniscieny*, a Thousand other Verities unknown to the world, and not at all revealed in Scripture, or Delivered by the

d Church

Church (for certainly He hath not revealed all He knowes) should now both inspire, and Assist twelve poore Fishermen, to preach infallibly these Truth never heard of before, yet so, that they *Teach* only, but do no Miracles, work no Conversions, shew no wonders, and give no other Testimony of their being sent from God, but by their own bare word. Would any men in the world, think ye, prudently believe them merely for their preaching, or would Sectaries as well Discover the Infallibility of these Verities taught by their preaching, as they now Discern the Scriptures infallibility? No, the whole world would prudently set light by such Doctrin, though in it self, both Divine and Infallible for want of prudent Motives to make it evidently Credible, and so all would have don, had the Apostles only preached the Divine Truths already registred in Scripture, without further Motives. Therefore more is required to prove that a Doctrin comes from God, then thus much only, that it contains *in it self* things highly suitable to the Divine nature, things above the finding out of humane reason, and conducing to piety. I say *in it self* for if we goe to a strict Analysis of the Scriptures Verities, we are not to suppose, as the Opponent doth, but to prove, that all these Verities are *suitable to the Divine nature*, which both Jewes and Gentils Do Deny, And therefore must be further proved.

22. Now if on the other side They grant, and most truly, that none would have Discovered any Infallibility in Apostolical Doctrin without further evidence of Miracles, of signs, and wonders, we have our Intent: For it followes inevitably, that Scripture cannot
be

be Discovered to be Divine by it self, nor *Infal-
 lible*, by vertue of any light contained in the words, or
 Syntax thereof. It followes 2. that *Mr. Stillingfleet* is
 more then a little out, in his seventh Interrogatory *par.*
1. Chap. 7. p. 230. sine, where He Ask's *whether it be
 not the highest Disparagement of this Divine Doctrin to make it
 stand in need of an Infalible Testimony of any*, that call them-
 selves the Catholick Church? Good Sir reflect. The-
 se Motives of Credibility manifested by *christ*, and his
 Apostles, their Miracles, Conversions, Sanctity &c.
 taken purely as Motives previous to the Faith, of tho-
 se who believed, were either fallible or Infalible (take
 whether side you will:) *If Infalible*; you evidently see
 that most certain Doctrin stood (without Disparage-
 ment) so far in need of those Inducements, that it
 would never have been believed without them (as is
 already proved) though most infalible in it self. If
 you hold those previous Inducements to be only
 Fallible, you must yet Grant, that the Belief of
 that Apostolical Doctrin stood still in need of them
 without any Disparagement. Therefore much less doth
 the Testimony of an Infalible Church Evidenced by
 the like Motives, Disparage it. I say *the Testimony of the
 Church Evidenced by clear Motives*; For as the learned *Suares*
Observes 3. Par. Tom. 2. Disp. 31. Sect. 2. n. Dico primo.
 The very Miracles of *Christ* precisely and solely consi-
 dered, (or sepatated from all other certain Principles)
 would not have proved Him to be the eternal Son of
 God, because God might have wrought Miracles by
 one that was purely *Man*, and not Omnipotent, and He
 did so *de facto*, by his Disciples, as He for told them,
John 14. 12. Majora horum faciens, that they should do
 d 2 greater

greater wonders. Therefore other Principles (and none could be more strong then *Christs* own Testimony) besides His Miracles, were necessary to beget certain Faith of his Godhead in Believers: And so we say, The Testimony of the Church, Evidenced by signes and wonders, is also necessary to beget a full Assurance of the Scriptures Infallibility, without it we have no Divine certainty of Gods Word.

23. Now I return a second Answer to the Objection, and say: A person that is not infallible can speak of things suitable to the *Divine Nature*, and *above the reach* of humane reason, of vertue and Godlines &c. For not only the book of *Herman*, or *Hermes* Called the Pastor, highly valued of by some Ancient Fathers, but other writings also, though untruely ascribed to the Apostles, often speak *Divinely*; yet never were admitted by the Church as Canonical, or Gods *Infallible* word. Nay more. Some parts of the Gospel, and the Epistles of *S. James* and *S. Jude* also, were not for a time received as Canonical by the Ancient Church, though they spak then as Divinely, and were as Infallibly Gods word, as they are now, the Ancient Church, that had eyes as good as Sectaries red them, yet Discoved no *Infallibility* or Divinity in them upon this account, that they spak of things suitable to the *Divine nature*. And who sees not, but that the books of *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*, contain as high Doctrin, as Divine Precepts, as are in Salomons Proverbs, or *Ecclesiastes*, yet the later are Divine with Sectaries, and the former not? And here I would willingly learn, whether the first Protestants that admitted of the later, and rejected the Other as Apocryphal, did so, because they smelt, as it were, a Divinity in those they received by

the very reading, and not in the former? I am sure, the more learned Protestants give other Reasons. For these grounds therefore I say, the Argument above is so unreasonable, that I wonder men of judgement Ventured to propose it. Now if they believe the Scripture to be Infallible, because of the Miracles and other wonders, *internal to the book*, wrought in confirmation of its Doctrin. Make a right *Analysis*, and Ask, why they believe these Miracles to be Infallible Scripture, and follow them closely till they come to a *Propositio Quiescens*, or an undoubted Principle? And you'll find the very Reason returned you, to be the thing in *Question*: Although we granted (which is not true) that Scripture it self said, all things contained in the book are infallibly Gods Word, For it would be demanded a new, How They know, that very Assertion to be Scripture.

24. For these Reasons some Sectaries will say, The Scriptures infallibility is to be proved by Discours, not grounded on the meer *light*, or *Majesty* therof, but by probable Principles extrinsick to it. And here is one Argument. We know by humane Authority Mortally certain, that Scripture was writ by holy men, Prophets, Euangelists, and Apostles. I answer, we know not so much of all the books in Scripture, without the Churches Testimony. For it is doubtful who writ the books of *Iosue* and *Iudges*, and it is still in Controversy, whether Salomon writ the Proverbs, and therefore, some, not only Catholicks but Sectaries also, are of opinion, that if we rely on humane and historical Authority only, we have greater and more particular Assurance, that *s. Thomas*, for example; writ his summ

of Divinity then we have Assurance of the particular Authors, of no few books in Holy Scripture. Again, though we had this certainty grounded on History, yet no man among Sectaries (who say all Churches erred before *Luther*) can tell us, upon moral certainty, whether the first Authentick Originals, were afterward Corrupted or no, by Ancient Hereticks, and the *supposed* erring Church of Rome. See more of this subject *Disc. 2. C. 2. n. 7. 8.* Others again may Argue, from the Miracles wrought by Scripture immediatly, And one was, as *Baronius* recounts, that this sacred book in *Diocletians* time being cast into the fire, the flames were forthwith extinguished. I Answer first, both this and other Miracles, were only wrought in the true Church, and at most prove (which is to be noted) that the book is true, pious, and holy, but is far from Convincing that (we now only inquire after) which is its *infallibility*. For, God might have don the like Miracle for a true Christian Catechisme, Had *Diocletian*, who desired to rase out all memory of Christianity, cast that into the Fire also. Others argue from the Accomplishment of Prophecies, which proves little, without the Testimony of the Church. First because the very Prophecies, and the fulfilling of them, must be proved to be Divine Scripture, and this cannot be don, abstracting from Church Authority. 2. These two things are to be distinguished: A power to Prophecy, and to write; as Hagiographers Did, *Canonical books*. One may prophesy, who only heares from a Prophet what was told him, upon the Prophets own Authority, but none can write *infallibly* Canonical books of Scripture, but such as have immediately the Assistance

stance of the Holy Ghost to direct him. In a word, here is the last and most true Resolution of all these Difficulties. Unless Sectaries rely on our Churches Testimony for the *Infallibility* of Scripture, they are evidently beaten out of all likelihood of other Principles, wherby to prove it is infallible. Yet this very Principle of the Church in order to them, doth little or nothing, for reasons clearly alleged Disc. 2. C. 2. n. 6. 7. It is needles to repeat them in this place.

25. And it is as needles to prove my second Assertion above n. 12. Which is. *Though Sectaries had Probable Evidence of the Scriptures infallibility in general, yet that doth them no service; because it is a useles book in their hands.* This Proposition is so Copiously proved, in the second Discours C. 1. and 2. Where much is said of Sectaries endles dissentions, concerning the sense of Scripture (though admitted of as Divine) that no Unorthodox man shall acquit Himself of the Difficulties, there proposed. All I'll do now (Though it hath not been my Custome to tire the Reader, with long Authorities of Ancient Fathers) is to mind him of one only Tertullians Testimony, in his book *de Præscriptionibus adversus Hæreticos* cap. 19. His words are. *Ergo non ac Scripturas provocandum est: nec in his constituendum certamen, in quibus aut nulla, aut incerta victoria est. (Rigaltius read's, per incerta, aut parum certa) Nam eisi non traderet collatio Scripturarum, ut utramque partem susteret, ordo rerum desiderabat illud prius proponi quod nunc solum disputandum est, quibus competat fides ipsa cujus sint Scriptura, à quo, & per quos, & quando, & quibus, sit Disciplina, quâ sunt Christiani. Vbi enim apparuerit esse veritatem discipline, & fidei Christiana, illic erit veritas Scripturarum, & expositionum*

sionum & omnium traditionum Christianorum.

The sense of this whole sentence is this. We are not therefore to appeal to Scriptures, nor are our debates to be determined here, wherein there is no victory, or a very uncertain one. For although there were no Collation, or comparing of places together, that might stay the two Advers parts, yet the order of things requires this to be first proposed, which is now only to be disputed *viz.* To whom the Faith appertains, wherof the Scriptures are. From whom, and by whom, when, and by what Persons, that *Discipline is*, wherby they were made Christians. For where there appears the Truth of *Discipline* (that is as *Macerus* and *Pamelius* interpret, the *Rule*) and of Christian Faith, there you shall have the Truth of Scriptures, the Interpretation of it likewise, and of all Christian Tradition. Observe well. The whole context of these words saith first, that debates can never be ended by Scripture only. 2. That before we Dispute by Scripture, we ought to know, and by other Reasons, who those are to whom Scripture belong's. 3. That where the Discipline, or Rule of Christian Faith is previously known, by other grounds distinct from Scripture, there you have the True Interpretation of Scripture, and all Christian Tradition. After a full ponderation of these words, I leave any man to Judge that loves Truth, whether that Doctrin be not here most remarkably expressed, which is taught and maintained, by the Roman Catholick Church.

26. *Mr. Poole* from his 12. page to his 37. hath no work for me, for his whole strain is to run on in cavils and finding fault with such Arguments of Catholicks,

licks, as He forsooth, judges inefficacious to prove the Churches Infallibility, whereas God knows, Had He had where withall to do it, He should have gon a contrary way, and proved positively by *Scripture*, *Fathers*, and *Tradition* the Churches *Fallibility*, but Herein He is silent, because in real Truth He hath nothing to say. The ground of the Churches Infallibility, which *Mr. Poole* never toucheth on, is briefly hinted at above n. 15. and further laid forth *Disc. 1. c. 1. and 2.* and I desire an expresse Answer to it. Now and then He hath something against the Writings of the Ancient Fathers, who with him are fallible, because they speak of the Churches Infallibility, and the good man never reflect's, that he and his little book, are far more fallible. I wave such trifles.

27. Page 37. He begins with his Distinctions of the Judge and rule of Faith, and saith first: The supreme and truly Infallible Judge of all Controversies is God and *Christ*. Very Good, but nothing is yet Done, unless you fallible man can say, in all the Differences between us, what God and *Christ* speak, what is judged for you, and against us, which is so far from being a Truth proved, that in Every Controversy it is the very thing in Question, and meerly supposed by you, without either Proof or Principle. You say again. The External and political Judges, to wit the Governours of the Church, are subordinate to the supreme Judge. Answ. Very true. But what then? Marry this followes, that if they really contradict the supreme Judges sentence, They must give their subjects leave to argue, whether it be right in the sight of God. Hold Sir a little. If you rationally contradict them,

you must first prove your self wiser then these subordinate Judges are, and Evidence their Errours by undoubted Principles, which is impossible. For either these Judges are Infallible, or fallible, if you grant the first, you cannot rationally contradict them. And if they be fallible: How dare you a private fallible man speak contrary, when your very Contradiction is no better then their opposite Assertion is, I mean *purely and poorly* Fallible? In a word without any certain Principle to rely on (which you shall never have) you too boldly take leave to oppose your Judges, and make your self a Rebel by it. You say 3. There is in Every particular Person a secret Judge, which is called Reason, or Conscience. I must Ask once more, what then? Have not *Arians, Pelagians, Quakers*, and all other Sectaries reason, as well as you? What therefore this Instrument of reason can apprehend, judge, and work in you after your fashion, it doth the like in these other, after Their fashion. Do you not therefore see how little you advance your cause by talking of your Reason; which, unles it be Evidenced by sure Principles to be better then that of your Adversaries; proves just nothing; And add what private *Spirit* you pleas to help your Reason out, They will talk as much of their contrary Spirit, to help theirs. These two points are so largely declared, and proved *Disc. 2. c. 5.* that I believe your Answer to them will prove unreasonable.

28. Page 40. You goe first very warily to work for no man knowes what you would say. Then you are manly resolute in your Decisions. *We willingly acknowledge (say you) and reverently esteem the true and right-ful Governors of the Church, orderly assembled and proceeding regularly in Councils, whose decisions are to be highly valued*

&c. Here is no man knowes what. Pray you speak
 out, and name more clearly the Church you reve-
 rently esteem of, Tell us who these true and rightful
 Governors, of it are (and do not put us of with an old
 piece of a long since rejected Doctrin. *They are those,*
who hold closely to the Truths of Scripture, for we must know
who these are.) Finally say when Councils are regularly
 assembled, not according to your Fancy, but, (which
 will be a long work for you) let us have lawes pre-
 scribed, wherby we may know by sure Principles more
 particularly, without this general talk, when Coun-
 cels are orderly assembled, or unorderly. A word
 now to your resolute Definitions. You say first, this
 Judge of the Church is not infallible; but subject to er-
 rour. Answer. And so are you, Sir, also fallible
 when you oppose your self to the Judgement of a Church,
 whether it be your own English Church, or the Roman
 Catholick: If therefore the Judgement of both Churches
 were supposed fallible (as the one is not) your
 singular Judgement is no more but fallible also; and
 what gain you by that? Thus much only: You
 Contradict the Church fallibly; and the Church again
 Contradicts you fallibly, and thus you may remain Con-
 tradicting one another to the Worlds End, without the
 Decision of one Controversy, unles you make it Evident
 by undoubted Principles, that you are to judge the
 Church when you please, and the Church is not to
 medle with you, nor your Judgement. You
 say 2. this judge of the Church being subject to hi-
 gher Authority, and tyed to a higher rule, if its De-
 cisions be Manifestly repugnant to that *superiour Rule*,
 they are not to be obeyed. Answer. You purely
 11. 11. e 2 sup-

suppose what should be proved. *Viz.* That the Decisions of the true Catholick Church, which is ever assisted by the Holy Ghost, can be repugnant to any Superiour Rule, and therefore touch not Catholicks in the least manner. But if you speak of the Decisions of your English Church, which (because fallible) may be repugnant, you license your self by your own Principles, to disobey it, And look you to that. You say. 3. *The judge is Constituted by God in the Church, not for the Command of mens Consciences, but for the regulation of their Actions, and Preservation of peace in the Church, which is not Violated by mens inward and unknown Sentiments, but by their External demeanour, and sensible Effects of them.*

Answ. Most pittiful Doctrin. What, is all the preaching of Sectaries Come to no more, but only to teach how the Exteriour Actions of men are to be regulated, and peace may be preserved? This Truly more be longs to the Iusticies of Peace in their Several Districts, then to Ministers, if therfore they goe no deeper into Consciences by their Doctrin, they certainly preach not the Word of God, for I read *Heb. 4. 12. the Word of God is lively and forcible, and more persing, then any two Edged Sword: and reaching unto the Division of the soule and Spirit, of the ioynts also and the Marrows &c.* And these men go no further, then only to give instructions concerning the Exteriour Regulation of Actions, or preserving of Peace. If therfore their Hearers were very Hypocrits, lewes or *Arians* in hart, and only demeaned themselves fairly in the Exteriour like Protestants, Ministers are not to medle with them but leave them to their own Consciences, without Check or reproof, wherof se more *Disf. 3. C. 7. n. 17. 18.* Now if *Mr. Foote* will

will find some Mystery in the words he useth *Command of mens Consciences*, let him read *S. Paul to Titus 2. 15. Hac loquere*. Speak these things, and rebuke *Cum omni Imperio*, with all *Command*, and *Authority*: And so Pastors should Speak to Consciences *Cum Imperio* in Gods cause, and people should obey them. The Apostle gives the reason. *Hebr. 13. 17.* Obey your Prelates, your Guides, or Commanders, for they watch, as being to render an account for your Souls. And if they must render an account of Souls, they may certainly speak like Prelates to their very interior Consciences.

29. Page 41. you say the Scriptures of the old and now Testament, are the Infalible rule and ground of Faith. *Ans.* They are so, Faithfully interpreted. See *Disc. 2. c. 4.* where you have your Errours Discovered, and the Objection fully Answered. You say again, Universal Tradition rightly understood is of great use, and like a channel, whereby Scripture (which alone is our rule) is conveyed to us. *Ans.* the Parenthesis* (*which alone*) is refuted in the Discours now cited, the rest of your Assertion hath no hurt in it. But you add a Mysterious piece of Divinity, where you distinguish between, *Res Traditam* the thing Delivered, & *Traditionem*, and the Tradition or Delivery of it, and say Papists by Tradition understand the first that is *res tradita*. *Ans.* either I understand not you, or you (which is more likely) misconceive the Doctrin of Catholicks, For they distinguish between *Tradition* and the thing Delivered: For example. The Baptizing of Infants, the keeping of Sunday in place of the Sabbath, are Objectively Doctrins delivered, and the Testimony, Consent, and Acknowledgment of the whole Universal Church

witnessing these Verities, are rightly called the formal *Tradition*, therefore you mistake our Doctrin. It is true as this word *Faith*, sometimes signifies the matter revealed by Almighty God, And most properly the *internal Assent* we yeild to the Revelation, so this word *Tradition* may also signify, either the Doctrin *delivered*, or the formal *Delivery* of it, but this makes not to your purpose. You say again, Tradition taken for the vehicle or conveyance of the books of Scripture, is in *some sort* necessary to bring the Rule to you, yet is no more a part of the Rule, then a Basquet is Nourishment wherein bread is brought to feed on. Here is your learned instance. Believe it, Sir, if you take the Basket, and find Nothing but a stone in it, you will have a poore dinner, And if you make Tradition *minutely* like the Basket (in *some sort necessary*) you may well have a stone for bread, that is, no Scripture given you, for Scripture. Tradition therefore, whether part of the Rule or no, is absolutely a necessary conveyance, and must be Infallible.

30. Page 44. you tell us. Scripture is the *Object*, *only rule*, and *standard* of Faith, by which all Controversies of Faith are to be *decided* and judged. Answer. The Proposition is only your own bare word: Scripture alone can be no rule without an Infallible Interpreter, as is proved *Disc. 2. c. 4.* And had we no more to say, but thus much, that Scripture proves not it self *to be Infallible* it were enough. But grant, which you yet Convince not, that it is infallibly Gods Word, an insuperable difficulty remains to be decided, And it is, whether you Sectaries know so exactly the sense of Scripture in all controverted matters, that your fallible

ble Glosses are to be stood to, contrary to the judgement of a learned Ancient Church? Hence I say, you talk at random, when page 48. you tell us. There is enough delivered in Scripture by which all Controversies might be ended, would men be humble, studious, and Self denying. Lay your hand on your hart, and speak your conscience, can you judge this to be true? Or can you perswade your self, that none are to be found within the limits of this Ancient Church as humble, as learned, and studious as a few Ministers are in England? Why vent you such Paradoxes without proof, or so much as a probability? You say again page 48. after some parergons of conditional, and absolute power, That if the Church be sufficient to end all Controversies, because all must submit to its decrees and Doctrin, the Scripture in like manner, may be said to be sufficient, because all are obliged to submit to the Decrees and Doctrin thereof. I Answer all are to do so, when they know by an infallible Interpreter what the Scriptures Teaches, but this in controverted matters, is ever the difficulty. You say it speak's one thing; and we say the contrary, therefore Scripture alone; which is as silent now, as it was Sixteene ages since, is a less meet Meanes to end these Contentions. Contrariwise, the Church proposeth all shee teaches with the greatest clarity; and if any doubt occur, is ready, able, and sufficient to declare it self further, Scripture that hitherto never ended any difference between us, cannot do so. For a further satisfaction read the 5. Ch. of the 3. Discours.

31. We return now to your 44. page where you tell us. *First*, Tradition is the Vehicle to convey the

the rule of Scripture to us. 2. Reason is the instrument or Eye, whereby you apprehend and see the Rule. 3. The Spirit of God is the Eye-salve that annoints your Eyes, and enables you to see the Rule. 4. The Church is the Interpreter (but not infallible and Authentick) the witness, or guardian of this Rule. Observe well. We have here a number of words, but Nothing proved, Nothing so much as cleared. Say therefore plainly: What tradition is it, that conveyed to you the books of Scripture? Most surely, it is the tradition of the Roman Catholick Church, for you have no other. If therefore, you dare trust this Church in a matter of so weighly importance, as to hand to you Gods Sacred Word, you may as well, and with as good Conscience, believe what ever other Doctrin it Teaches by Tradition. See *Disc. 2. C. 2. n. 4. 5.* You talk secondly of Reason, that sees this Rule of Scripture, and you certainly mean the *true sense* of it, or you say nothing. Now I would willingly learn, how your Reason comes to have the priviledge, or preheminance of knowing such Secrets, before your elder Brethren the Papists, or your more neerer Allies the Quaakers, or the old Arians? The like doubt I move about the Eye-salve, that annoints your Eyes, you call it the Spirit of God, And I am sure there is no *Donatist*, or *Pelagian*, but will say as much of his contrary Spirit. But above all satisfy me in one doubt, and plainly point me out the Church that interpret's Scripture as you do in all those matters of Controversy now between us? I tell you Sir: There was never any such Church in the world fallible or infallible, that favours your glosses and interpretations of Scripture.

32. Page 46. You have a Fling at the Captains Arguments against the *judgement of Reason*, who, if you relate truly, (for I have not now his Epistle by me) saith first. Reason must submit to the judge, therefore it is not the judge. You Answer. *It is not the supreme judge, but subordinate, and tyed to Rule.* *Contra.* Every judgement with you is fallible, and may easily Swerve from the rule, or mistake the supreme judges Sentence: if it do so, it is erroneous and not to be followed. Say therefore, who ties your judgement that is fallible, and may be fals, to any *certain Rule*? This should be Answered.

33. He Objects again. The judge must be Infalible, but reason is fallible, *Ergo.* You Answer: *The Maior is a pittiful Petitio principij.* *Contra.* Your Reply is more pittiful. Observe well. All judgements, you say, are fallible, and many are not only fallible, but fals also. Most surely, you will not have us to follow any fals judgement, and yet we must follow a fallible judgement. Vouchsafe, to tell us, whose fallible judgement we are to trust to, in these weighty matters of Controversy? And I have all reason to be satisfied in the doubt, because it avail's me Nothing, to know that I must rely on a fallible judgement which may be fals, *Unless you teach me whose fallible judgement it is*, I am to rely on. For example: When you interpret a passage of Scripture contrary to the Churches Sense, your explication is fallible, Answer therefore, why will you rather have me to rest on your judgement that is fallible, then on the Churches contrary sense, though it were falsly Supposed fallible? If you say, All things considered, your explication is

F

more

more probable, you are the very man, that pittifully begg's the Question, and speak's without any probable Principle.

34. Now, if wearied with those Interrogatories; you say roundly (and this must be answered in your Principle) that every man is to follow his own judgement, in these debated matters; The *Arian* is to follow his private judgement, the *Socinian* his, the *Quaker* his, the *Donatist* his &c. you do not only license all the Hereticks in the world, to remain still in their Heresies, But moreover Counsel them to believe Falsities, for you know, or should know, that these private judgements are all fals. If finally you Answer: We must rest on a judgement that is *True*, although it be fallible, I know not what you mean, for no man amongst you, can assure me in these high points of Controversy, when a judgement is to be reckoned of as true, that is fallible, because Truth is most easily separated from an *Act*, that is really *Fallible*.

35. In a word, Sir, your whole Mistake lies in this. You sound not to the bottom, the signification of these words. The *Judgement of Reason*. For *Reason* in this place, cannot be taken, for a weak Discours, or the private Sentiment of every erring man, after He hath humm'd over, or paus'd on Scripture (the *Arian* or *Socinian*, will make his Religion good this way) but the *Judgement of Reason* Goes further, and ought to be deeply rational indeed, that is: It must rest at last upon a solid and satisfactory Principle, which thoroughly pondered, work's powerfully upon every prudent disinterested Understanding, and gently forceth the man, that layes prejudice aside, to acquiesce and yeild, without fear or trouble

ble. The Catholick Church of *Christ* only, most evidently proposeth these undoubted satisfactory Principles, wheron a rational judgement doth rest securely, when the Faith sheweth it is resolved. No Sectary ever yet shewed, nor shall hereafter show, any think like a Satisfactory Principle, to ground a rational judgement on, when He believes contrary to this Church. All he can do is to tell us, what *He thinks*, but you shall never learn from him, upon any solid Principle, extrinsecal to his own bosomie thoughts, *That God speaks as He thinks*. But I have said so much of this Subject *Disc. 1. c. 7. n. 4. 5. and Disc. 2. c. 5. n. 8. 9. 10.* that it is needles to add More.

16. To the 3. Argument. *If Reason were judge a man might please God without Faith*, (I know not whether you propose it fully enough) you Answer, this would overthrow the Church. You are much deceived, for the Church teaches, that none can please God without Faith. In your fourth Answer, you are tying up again your Reason, to a *Law* and *Rule* in things you understand not. Sir, if you understand not, you want cords to tye fast withall, and therefore may easily not close, with the supreme Judges Sentence. But of this we have said enough already. You will find the substance of what follows in your Appendix referred upon several occasions in the Treatise. Had I more time, I would say a word to your Glosses upon these two places of Scripture quoted by you. In the first, though *S. Peter* saith contrary 2. *Pet. 3. 16.* that Scripture is difficile to be understood, you will have it easy, unles it be to the ignorant and ungodly: and 'tis likely you suppose, there are none of these ignorant or ungodly people among

44 *Notes upon Mr. Pooles Appendix.*

you. Upon the other Text 2. *Tim.* 3. 15. 16. you seem to infer, from the Utility of Scripture, a sufficiency in order to Salvation, which is as good an Inference as if you said : Your head is profitable to make you to live, therefore it is sufficient. Or, the Principles of Philosophy can instruct you to learn Divinity, Ergo they make you a perfect Divine. Sir, the general Truths contained in Scripture, because they reach us to believe the Church, Tradition and other Apostolical Doctrins, orally delivered, are in this general way, able to make us wise to Salvation, but none can so much as probably draw from hence, that all things in particular, necessary to Salvation, are explicitly set down in Scripture. Every Catholick Writer that Explicates the Text, shewes your Deductions to be weak, and unconcluding. That work therefore being don to my hand, I end, wishing you much Good, and eternal happiness.

FINIS.

Besides other faults noted in the beginning you have these.

In the Advertisment. pag. 18. l. 22. Invocations R. Innovations p. 19. l. 16. of long standing Church our R. of our long standing Church p. 22. l. 5. were R. where in the Treatise p. 49. l. 7. Fallibility R. Infallibility p. 158. l. 18. impropriety R. impropriety p. 176. l. 18. Mark R. mark p. 239. l. 3. above R. about.



RESTAURO del LIBRO ANTICO
Gav. G. DI GIACOMO
PESCARA

NOV 1969

